

7008. Also, petition of Amanda L. Bates and five other residents of Gilsun, N. H., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7009. By Mr. WATRES: Petition of residents of Elmhurst, Pa., favoring legislation to increase pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7010. Also, petition of residents of Taylor, Pa., to increase pension of Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7011. Also, petition of residents of Carbondale, Pa., favoring legislation to increase the pension of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7012. Also, petition of residents of Moscow, Pa., favoring legislation to increase the pension of Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7013. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of Pleasants County, W. Va., favoring additional pension legislation for widows, etc., of soldiers of Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7014. Also, petition of citizens of Huntington, W. Va., relative to additional pension legislation for widows, etc., of soldiers of Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7015. By Mr. WURZBACH: Petition of N. Altermann, H. C. Brown, and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., advocating the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7016. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of citizens of Derry, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging passage of an amendment to House bill 120 (Public Law 148) to increase the salaries of Federal jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, February 18, 1927

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 17, 1927)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PRAYER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, since we have taken a recess we do not have what possibly we need very much, and that is the services of the Chaplain. Because that service is omitted to-day, I ask unanimous consent to have the clerk read at the desk a prayer recently delivered by the president of the University of Wisconsin before the Senate of Wisconsin at the opening session of the legislature of that State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Almighty God, Lord of all governments, help us in the opening hours of this legislative session to realize the sanctity of politics. * * *

Give us the insight and grant us the power to lift this business of government into an adventure that we may with reverence call the politics of God, because by it we shall seek to fashion the life of this Commonwealth in the likeness of that city of God which has been the dream of saints and seers for unnumbered centuries.

Save us from the sins to which we shall be subtly tempted as the calls of parties and the cries of interests beat upon this seat of government. Save us from thinking about the next election when we should be thinking about the next generation.

Save us from dealing in personalities when we should be dealing in principles.

Save us from thinking too much about the vote of majorities when we should be thinking about the virtue of measures.

Save us in crucial hours of debate from saying the things that will take when we should be saying the things that are true.

Save us from indulging in catchwords when we should be searching for facts.

Save us from making party an end in itself when we should be making it a means to an end. * * *

May we have greater reverence for the truth than for the past. Help us to make party our servant rather than our master.

May we know that it profits us nothing to win elections if we lose our courage.

May we be worthy of the high calling of government. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 4808) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities.

LXVIII—259

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 68. An act authorizing Dominic I. Murphy, consul general of the United States of America, to accept a silver fruit bowl presented to him by the British Government;

S. 545. An act for the payment of damages to certain citizens of New Mexico caused by reason of artificial obstructions to the flow of the Rio Grande by an agency of the United States;

S. 598. An act for the relief of Alexander McLaren;

S. 612. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Wooten;

S. 867. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Columbus Hospital, Great Falls, Mont., for the treatment of disabled Government employees;

S. 1304. An act for the relief of Hunter-Brown Co.;

S. 1456. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of H. C. Ericsson;

S. 1860. An act for the relief of F. G. Proudfoot;

S. 2302. An act for the relief of Elisha K. Henson;

S. 2618. An act for the relief of the National Surety Co.;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of the Capital Paper Co.;

S. 3462. An act for the relief of Homer H. Hacker;

S. 3918. An act for the relief of Robert R. Bradford;

S. 4268. An act for the relief of H. W. Krueger and H. J. Selmer, bondsmen for the Green Bay Dry Dock Co., in their contract for the construction of certain steel barges and a dredge for the Government of the United States;

S. 4669. An act for the relief of the Kentucky-Wyoming Oil Co. (Inc.);

S. 4756. An act for the relief of Capt. Ellis E. Haring and Edward F. Batchelor;

S. 4933. An act authorizing an appropriation for public highways in the Virgin Islands of the United States;

S. 4943. An act for the relief of George H. Cecil;

S. 5084. An act to provide for the payment of the amount of an adjusted-service certificate to Irving D'Forrest Parks, beneficiary designated by Corpl. Steve McNeil Parks, deceased;

H. R. 2. An act to further amend the national banking laws and the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the eradication or control of the European corn borer.

EXPENDITURES OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY FOR INDIAN TRIBES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of November 17, 1926, and a supplemental report of November 27, 1926, by the Director of the Geological Survey relative to expenditures made by that survey for the benefit of Indian tribes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INHABITANTS OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2770) to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto, which was on page 4, after line 2, to insert the following:

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the West Indian Islands acquired by the United States from Denmark by the convention entered into between said countries on the 4th day of August, 1916, and ratified by the Senate of the United States on the 7th day of September, 1916, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1917, is amended by striking out the figure "8" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "6."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives. I can explain it in a moment.

Under the present law there is an export duty of \$8 per ton on sugar from the Virgin Islands. The House were of the opinion, after extensive hearings, that there ought to be a very considerable reduction in that duty. They favored a much larger reduction than is here proposed, but the members of the Senate committee were not agreeable to so large a reduction, though they were agreeable to a reduction of 25 per cent. The amendment provides for a reduction in the export duty on sugar from the Virgin Islands from \$8 per ton to \$6 per ton.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A resolution adopted by a joint committee of the House and Senate of the Twentieth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota relative to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, memorializing the President of the United States relative to such seaway

Whereas a joint board of engineers representing the United States and Canada have officially and unanimously declared ship-channel connection between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic by way of the St. Lawrence to be practical; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States appointed to determine the need of such a seaway has unanimously declared, in its report to the President made December 27, 1926, that—

"The construction of the shipway from the Great Lakes to the sea is imperative both for the relief and for the future development of a vast area in the interior of the continent"; and that—

"It has been estimated that the value in a single year to the farmers alone would equal the capital cost of the waterway"; and that—

"The economic importance of the improvement would be far greater than the savings made upon the actual tonnage transported, important though that would be"; and

Whereas the extension of the commerce of the State of North Dakota, the development of her resources, her present prosperity, and her future welfare all demand world-trade contracts by way of direct low-cost ocean transportation to and from the markets of the world; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway would give to the State of North Dakota ocean ports on the Great Lakes practically at her front door; would give direct ocean transportation with wider and lower cost of movement to world markets; would increase the demand for her products, and would thereby assure to her agriculture, now depressed, and in particular to her grain, dairy, and livestock producers, a marked degree of permanent relief from present excessive transportation costs and a more favorable basic price for all farm production; and

Whereas such seaway would permanently lower her transportation charges both on exports and on imports and would thereby stimulate the development of her present industries, invite new enterprise, and would generally assure to her citizens an enlarged and abiding prosperity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That we do most earnestly urge upon the President of the United States the imperative national need of the St. Lawrence seaway, and further express to him the earnest desire of this State that immediate steps be taken for the negotiation of a treaty with Canada to that end; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, the chairman of the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota in the Congress.

WALTER MADDOCK,
President of the Senate.

W. D. AUSTIN,
Secretary of the Senate.

JUAN SAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

C. E. VEVOY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of the enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1, of the Senate of the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, as approved by the Governor of the State of Wyoming.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming. Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 15th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

A. M. CLARK, *Secretary of State.*
By H. M. SYMON, *Deputy.*

Enrolled Joint Memorial 1, Senate of the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to prevent the increase of grazing fees on the national forests

Whereas an increase in the grazing fees in the national forests seem imminent from reports received; and

Whereas the livestock industry, together with agriculture, is the basic industry of our State, upon which all other industries are largely dependent; and

Whereas the livestock industry has not recovered from the recent overwhelming disaster, which has extended to every agricultural enterprise in this State, whereby every business in the State has suffered, and is still suffering almost beyond endurance; and

Whereas the stockmen of this State are overburdened at this time with excessive forest fees, for grazing stock on ranges which should properly belong to the State; and

Whereas any further advance in fees will be ruinous to stockmen at this time and for many years to come; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture is commercializing our national forests at the expense of the business interests of the State; and

Whereas the comparison of rentals from the national forest grazing permits with the rentals from privately owned pasture and range is misleading and erroneous in that the privately owned pastures and ranges permit the building up of purebred herds and the grazing of same during the whole year as against a short period of time on the national forest grazing permits; and

Whereas more protection is furnished in the privately owned pastures as against that furnished in the national forest grazing permits in that they are equipped with sheds, corrals, and fences; and

Whereas the dates of ingress to the national forest and egress therefrom are fixed dates; and

Whereas the cost of the use of same is paid in advance; and

Whereas severe storms and heavy snows compel the removal of stock therefrom before expiration of the allotted time which thereby reduces the value of grazing permits; and

Whereas the National Government is benefited to a great extent by the control and prevention of forest fires by the grazing of livestock in said national forests: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to prevail upon the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent the increase of forest fees in the several grazing districts in the grazing States, and to the effect that they remain as they now are for the next ensuing 10-year period; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to our Senators, Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN and Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK, and our Representative, the Hon. CHARLES E. WINTER, and to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, William M. Jardine, and the governors of all Western States that have national forests within their boundaries, urging their cooperation.

PERRY W. JENKINS,
President of the Senate.
A. W. MCCOLLOUGH,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, 2 p. m., February 14, 1927.

FRANK C. EMERSON, *Governor.*

Mr. WARREN also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Upton, Wyo., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any similar Sunday observance legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KENDRICK presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to the matter of the increase of forest fees in the several grazing districts in the grazing States, and favoring their remaining as they now are for the next ensuing 10-year period, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (See joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. WARREN).

Mr. HALE presented the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which were ordered to lie on the table:

STATE OF MAINE, 1927.

Resolutions favoring the passage by Congress of legislation relative to the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the United States Army

Whereas there is pending before Congress of the United States Senate bill No. 3027, known as the Tyson bill, and House of Representatives bill No. 4548, known as the Fitzgerald bill, these bills making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War; and

Whereas such proposed legislation is equitable and seeks to do justice to a class of worthy disabled officers entitled, because of their service, their wounds, and disabilities incurred therefrom, to the same consideration and privileges as men of their rank who performed the same service, but were of the Regular Army; and

Whereas officers of such class are only disabled officers to which the privileges of retirement have been extended, the same class of officers

of the Navy and Marine Corps already being retired under law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine urges upon Congress the importance and desirability of speedily passing such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

On motion of Mr. Varnum, of Westbrook, adopted February 10, 1927. Sent up for concurrence.

CLYDE R. CHAPMAN, Clerk.

IN SENATE, February 11, 1927.

On motion of Mr. Slocum, of Cumberland, adopted in concurrence. ROYDEN V. BROWN, Secretary.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF MAINE,
Office of Secretary of State.

I, Edgar C. Smith, secretary of state of the State of Maine, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in legislature assembled with the original thereof, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed. Given under my hand at Augusta, this 15th day of February, A. D. 1927, and in the one hundred and fifty-first year of the independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL.]

EDGAR C. SMITH,
Secretary of State.

Mr. HALE also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GOULD presented resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine, favoring the passage of legislation providing for the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the Army, which were ordered to lie on the table. (See resolutions printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. HALE.)

Mr. ERNST presented memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other legislation religious in character, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENEEN presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of Chicago, Mount Sterling, and other cities and towns in the State of Illinois, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows and for the removal of the limitation on the date of marriage of Civil War widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday or any other legislation religious in character, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizen of Galena, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Topeka and Scammon, in the State of Kansas, praying for the prompt passage of legislation regulating radio broadcasting, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WILLIS presented the memorial of Joseph B. Hagman, of Lagrange, and other memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens of Columbus and Lorain County, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other legislation religious in character, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented letters, in the nature of petitions, from sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., praying

for the prompt passage of legislation creating a commission to make a survey and study of the civil service retirement law, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wapato, Wash., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 4821) to provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, or any other legislation religious in character, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends at Everett, Wash., remonstrating against the present policy of the United States Government in connection with Mexican and Nicaraguan affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Centralia, Wash., remonstrating against the present policy of the United States Government in connection with affairs in Mexico and other Latin American countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15539) relating to certain cotton reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SWANSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5699) relating to the admission of candidates to the Naval Academy (Rept. No. 1510); and

A bill (H. R. 9030) for the retirement as ensign of Hampton Mitchell (Rept. No. 1511).

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 5263) to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1512) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 5443) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1513) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 18, 1927, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 68. An act authorizing Dominic I. Murphy, consul general of the United States of America, to accept a silver fruit bowl presented to him by the British Government;

S. 545. An act for the payment of damages to certain citizens of New Mexico caused by reason of artificial obstructions to the flow of the Rio Grande by an agency of the United States;

S. 598. An act for the relief of Alexander McLaren;

S. 612. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Wooten;

S. 867. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Columbus Hospital, Great Falls, Mont., for the treatment of disabled Government employees;

S. 1304. An act for the relief of Hunter-Brown Co.;

S. 1456. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of H. C. Ericsson;

S. 1860. An act for the relief of F. G. Proudfoot;

S. 2302. An act for the relief of Elisha K. Henson;

S. 2618. An act for the relief of the National Surety Co.;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of the Capital Paper Co.;

S. 3462. An act for the relief of Homer H. Hacker;

S. 3918. An act for the relief of Robert R. Bradford;

S. 4268. An act for the relief of H. W. Krueger and H. J. Selmer, bondsmen for the Green Bay Dry Dock Co., in their contract for the construction of certain steel barges and a dredge for the Government of the United States;

S. 4669. An act for the relief of the Kentucky-Wyoming Oil Co. (Inc.);

S. 4756. An act for the relief of Capt. Ellis E. Haring and Edward F. Batchelor;

S. 4933. An act authorizing an appropriation for public highways in the Virgin Islands of the United States;

S. 4943. An act for the relief of George H. Cecil; and

S. 5084. An act to provide for the payment of the amount of an adjusted-service certificate to Irving D'Forrest Parks, beneficiary designated by Corpl. Steve McNeil Parks, deceased.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 5760) to suspend the issuance of water-power licenses on the Colorado River until ratification of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5761) granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Spencer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 5762) to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5763) granting an increase of pension to George N. Julian (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 5764) granting an increase of pension to Ann Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5765) granting an increase of pension to Josephine M. Canright (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5766) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 5767) authorizing an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5768) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Parsons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 5769) to prevent fraud in respect to the sale or disposition of securities through agencies of interstate or foreign commerce and to provide a summary proceeding therefor and penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to regulate radio broadcasting stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. STANFIELD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 166) amending the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1924; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McKELLAR submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4663) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KEYES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the second deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

On page —, line —, insert the following:

"For the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), as amended, \$1,000,000, which amount shall continue available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1928."

VETERANS' HOSPITAL AT SOAP LAKE, WASH.

Mr. DILL. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 359) was ordered to lie on the table and read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is hereby directed to investigate the advisability of establishing a

Veterans' Bureau hospital at Soap Lake, in the State of Washington, and to report to the Senate at the beginning of the first regular session of the Seventieth Congress.

INSURANCE OF THE FARMER

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, but that no action be taken on it except to refer it to the committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 360) was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to report to the Senate at the beginning of the first regular session of the Seventieth Congress his views as to whether the insurance of the farmer by the Federal Government against droughts, floods, and storms would be consistent with sound, governmental, and economic policy; and, if so, under what conditions such insurance should be issued.

HON. MAGNUS JOHNSON

Mr. ERNST submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 361), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1926, to Hon. Magnus Johnson the sum of \$2,500, in full payment for all expenses, including fees and expenses of his attorneys, incurred in prosecution of his claim to a seat in the Senate in the contest of the election of a Senator from the State of Minnesota in 1924.

TAX ON AMERICAN LEGION PASSAGE TICKETS

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 1510, the bill (H. R. 16775) to limit the application of the internal-revenue tax upon passage tickets. This is a bill passed by the House which waives the head tax of \$5 on steamship transportation tickets for the members of the American Legion in attendance at the Legion convention in Paris the coming summer. I may say that the French Government has waived all passport and visa regulations, and it is my opinion that we should concur in the action of the House in waiving the head tax of \$5.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that the Committee on Finance reported the bill unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the provisions of Title VIII of the revenue act of 1926 imposing a tax on passage tickets shall not apply to any round-trip passage ticket issued to any individual if—

(1) Such individual is certified, by such national officer or officers of the American Legion and in such form and manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulations prescribe, as authorized to participate in the 1927 national convention of the American Legion or of the American Legion Auxillary, to be held at Paris, France; and

(2) The eastbound portion of the passage covered by the ticket is upon a vessel certified, by such national officer or officers of the American Legion and in such form and manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulations prescribe, as having been designated by the American Legion France convention committee as an official ship, and such vessel is scheduled to sail on or after June 1, 1927, and not later than September 15, 1927.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. PITTMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edge	Hawes	Neely
Bingham	Edwards	Heflin	Norris
Blease	Ernst	Howell	Nye
Borah	Ferris	Johnson	Oddie
Bratton	Fess	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Broussard	Fletcher	Kendrick	Phipps
Bruce	Frazier	Keyes	Pine
Cameron	Gillett	King	Pittman
Capper	Glass	La Follette	Ransdell
Caraway	Gooding	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.
Copeland	Gould	McKellar	Reed, Pa.
Couzens	Greene	McMaster	Robinson, Ark.
Curtis	Hale	McNary	Robinson, Ind.
Dale	Harrell	Mayfield	Sackett
Deneen	Harris	Metcalf	Schall
Dill	Harrison	Moses	Sheppard

Shipstead
Shortridge
Smith
Smoot
Steck

Stephens
Stewart
Swanson
Trammell
Tyson

Underwood
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mass.
Warren
Watson

Wheeler
Willis

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are holding a hearing as a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 9971) for the regulation of radio communications, and for other purposes.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am satisfied that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate are trying to live up to the prayer which was read earlier in our proceedings.

I believe we are about to vote on the conference report on the radio bill. I think that more advice has been given from the country with regard to this proposed legislation and that there is less knowledge in the country with regard to it than as to any legislation I have ever known in all the 14 years I have been here. It is certainly impossible to expect the people of the country to understand what is pending here when it would be safe to say that not half the Senators have read the bill which they are asked to adopt. I am always pleased to receive petitions from the people of the country with regard to legislation, particularly with regard to those matters about which the petitioners are supposed to know something, and about which they generally do know more than those who are attempting to legislate.

The telegrams which I have received have stated nothing with regard to the pending legislation except that some legislation should be passed so as to avoid confusion. I wish to charge—and I have the evidence to sustain the charge—that during the discussion of this conference report broadcasting stations throughout the United States have deliberately, by changing their wave lengths, brought about the confusion, and then, after having brought about that confusion they have, over the same broadcasting stations, said, "This is what will continue unless Congress shall pass the radio bill."

Mr. President, there is no Senator or Representative but desires to have legislation to control radio. The question is, Shall we pass any bill that the conferees hand to us under the fear that it is the only legislation we can get? That is the exact position in which we are put at the present time.

I have no desire to kill this legislation; I am as anxious as is anyone for its passage. What I do desire, however, is that the Senate shall send back to conference this conference report with the suggestion that the conferees remedy certain defects in the bill that are due to the action of the conferees and not to the action of the Senate or House of Representatives.

I have prepared and written out the objections which I have to this conference bill. I have done so in order that they may be stated definitely and briefly, and I will now read those objections. The chief objections are these:

(a) Both the Senate bill and the House bill asserted the absolute and exclusive right of the United States to use and control the ether and radio channels for wireless and other purposes and denied the right of any individual or corporation to acquire any right in the use of the ether or radio channels as against the United States. The substitute bill reported by the conferees of the two Houses only claims the right of the United States—

to regulate all forms of interstate and radio transmissions * * * and to provide for the use of such channels, but not the ownership thereof, by individuals, firms, or corporations for limited periods of time under license granted by Federal authority * * *

(b) The Senate bill provided—

No license shall be granted until the applicant, either for a license or for a renewal of license, has signed under oath a waiver of any claim of right to any wave length or to the use of the ether because of any previous use of the same whether by license or otherwise.

This requirement has been eliminated from the legislation and is not contained in the conference bill.

(c) The House bill and the Senate bill each contained an identical provision as follows:

Determine the location of classes of stations or individual stations (with due consideration of the right of each State to have allocated to it or to some person, firm, or company or corporation within it the use

of a wave length for at least one broadcasting station located or to be located in such State whenever application may be made therefor) and the kind of apparatus to be used with respect to its external effect.

In the House bill this determination was to be made by the Secretary of Commerce, while in the Senate bill such determination was to be made by the radio commission. This legislation has been entirely eliminated and no such provision appears in the conference bill.

(d) The Senate bill in section C, subdivision K, protects against and prohibits all unjust and unreasonable charges to listeners. This legislation is eliminated and no such protection is included in the conference bill. It is admitted that, under the bill, broadcasters have the authority and power to charge for listening in.

(e) The Senate bill provided, among other grounds, that the commission might revoke a license if the licensee—

has failed to provide reasonable facilities for the transmission of radio communications, or has made any unjust and unreasonable charge, or has been guilty of any discrimination, either as to charge or as to service or has made or prescribed any unjust and unreasonable classification, regulation, or practice with respect to the transmission of radio communications or service.

This authority granted to the commission in the Senate bill is eliminated in the conference bill. In the conference bill neither the radio commission or the Secretary of Commerce has authority to investigate any charges or protests made against a licensee on such grounds. According to the provisions of the conference bill before the Secretary of Commerce or the radio commission can consider any protests or charges upon such grounds the Interstate Commerce Commission must first have found that such charges are well founded. In other words, in the conference bill the radio commission that has the power to revoke has not the power to consider or determine such charges. There is a serious doubt whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has been granted authority to make such investigations. It is evident that the Interstate Commerce Commission has no knowledge concerning the radio industry and science and has not time to acquire such knowledge. It is well known that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was established for the purpose of regulating common carriers by land and by telephone and telegraph, has more work already imposed upon it than it can perform.

(f) The Senate bill provided for the control and regulation of the ether, radio channels, wave lengths, and the radio industry by a permanent bipartisan commission selected from various sections and zones of the United States, a majority of whose members would be constantly in office. The House bill provided for such control by the Secretary of Commerce. In the natural course of events Secretaries of Commerce change. It is reasonable to expect that the benefits to be obtained from the services of a constant and permanent regulatory body can not be expected from a Secretary of Commerce. The conference bill limits the exclusive authority of the radio commission to one year. After that primary authority is granted to the Secretary of Commerce while certain appellate power is still retained in the commission. The salary of the commission ceases after one year and only a per diem is allowed when they are called together. No satisfactory commission can thus be maintained.

(g) Section 27 of the conference bill provides that—

* * * no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any message and divulge or publish the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted message to any person; * * *

This language does not limit such message to one of a private or personal nature, and therefore must apply to all messages. The language in its uncertainty is dangerous. It might be construed to prohibit the interception and publication of a speech by the Premier of England sent by the broadcasting corporation of England to the Radio Corporation of America. It might be construed to prevent the interception and publication of a speech by the President of the United States sent by one radio corporation to another radio corporation.

(h) No authority is given to the commission or the Secretary of Commerce to limit the extent to which broadcasting stations may be utilized for purely advertising purposes. The owners of the 15,000,000 purchased radio receiving sets in the United States are interested in the character of matter that is broadcast. This subject becomes particularly material when it is understood that there are only 89 effective broadcasting channels.

Mr. President, those are the chief objections that I find to this legislation. I wish to say now that the Senate and the House had a right to prepare such legislation; but such legislation was not prepared either by the United States Senate or by the House of Representatives. There are many provi-

sions in this bill which have been prepared by the conferees that do not appear in either House or Senate bill, and there are provisions in identical language in both House and Senate bills that do not appear in this conference bill.

It has always been understood in this body that matters agreed on by both Houses in separate bill should not be disturbed by conferees. It is very natural that the people of the country should not understand the functions of conferees when there is such a difference of opinion in the United States Senate with regard to the functions of conferees. Under our form of government it is essential that a bill pass both Houses of Congress before it is signed and becomes a law. There are two separate bodies. If a bill originates in the House, as did this radio bill, when it comes to the Senate the Senate is at liberty to use the House bill as the foundation for its legislation, to adopt the House bill as it is, or to strike out certain provisions of the House bill and add provisions of its own, or the Senate has the power to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and write its own bill. If that is done, the Senate bill goes back to the House in that form as an amendment to the House bill. The House may accept the amendment of the Senate—which means to accept the Senate bill—or it may ask for a conference; and it will appoint, we will say, three Members of the House, and the Senate will appoint three Members of the Senate, and they will then take the two bills and try to adjust the differences in the legislation.

From time immemorial, since conferees have been known, it has been understood that their functions were limited to dealing with the subject matter of the two bills in the first place, and making only such changes as were essential to adjust the differences between the two Houses. That was violated more or less, however; so in 1918 the Senate of the United States adopted this rule. I read the second paragraph of Rule XXVII:

Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference.

I have just called attention to the fact that there are several provisions in identical language in the House bill and in the Senate bill that do not appear in this conference bill. With regard to one of them—subdivision (d) of section C, as it appears in the Senate bill—a provision guaranteeing to each State the allocation of at least one wave length for broadcasting purposes, I raised the question here on the floor on a point of order made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]; and the Senate sustained the Chair in holding that the conferees had not violated Rule XXVII by leaving out that identical paragraph in both bills.

Whether or not the Senate be right in its ruling, that omission still stands as an objection to this bill. I am not interested in the Radio Corporation of America, nor am I interested in any broadcasting concern. I am interested, of course, as a listener-in. I am interested with those who have purchased the 15,000,000 radio-receiving sets in the United States. I am one of them. I understand what they wish from personal experience and from conversations with them. I know that this bill, written by the conferees, makes no provision whatever against charging for listening in. I know that this bill makes no provision whatever against charging for patented devices which will be essential to listening in. I know that there is nothing in this conference bill that gives the licensing authority and the authority that has the right to revoke licenses any power to fix charges, any power to regulate charges, any power to prohibit charging for listening in, any power to revoke a license for putting a charge on listening in.

I tell you, sir, that the 15,000,000 listeners-in of this country are being ruthlessly deceived by the broadcasting corporations of this country. It would seem that the 15,000,000 listeners-in would at least have some suspicion with regard to the wholehearted sympathy of the broadcasting concerns for them.

Broadcasting concerns can not make money out of the broadcasting business from now on unless they charge those who listen to them. Why? Up to the present date the broadcasting concerns have earned their money through the sale of receiving sets. They have sold nearly a billion dollars' worth of receiving sets, and they could afford to hire entertainers to broadcast, because it encouraged the purchase of radio sets. But now that the country is saturated to a great extent with radio sets—15,000,000 sets have been purchased and probably as many more have been manufactured by individuals—they must look to some other source to justify their continuance in operation.

No one objects to that, but they should not be allowed to charge unlimited sums for listening, should they?

Everyone knows that this has got to be a monopoly. It is a natural monopoly. The Secretary of Commerce states that he believes that the best service will be given by a few super-powerful broadcasting stations. He is probably right. A great many persons who have studied the matter believe that greater service can be rendered in that way; but that makes the power of regulation all the more necessary.

What powers of regulation has this bill in it? It is the most astounding thing you ever read. It does not give to the officer that licenses and the commission that may revoke licenses the power to fix charges. It does not give either the Secretary or the commission the power to investigate charges. It does not give either the power to investigate discriminations. It does not give either the power to investigate lack of service.

Think of such a bill! Here you are seeking now to regulate a known monopoly, an inevitable monopoly, and yet you give to one man after a year the power to issue these licenses; you reserve the power to a commission to revoke them; and yet you do not give either one of those the authority to regulate the charges. There is no power in the bill to fix charges. You do not give them any power to regulate service. You do not give them any power to prevent discriminations.

That must appear to be a great mistake. You will have to have a firm control over this industry. If it is better to put it in the hands of one man, like the Secretary of Commerce, instead of in the hands of a commission, all right; but when you recognize the fact that this industry has to be controlled by a strong hand, why do you withhold from that strong hand the power to regulate? If there ever was a bill manufactured for the very purpose of preventing regulation, it is this bill.

The Senate bill, which we considered carefully here, gave to a commission constituted like the Interstate Commerce Commission the same powers that the Interstate Commerce Commission has, and those powers would have included the power to fix rates and charges and prohibit discriminations. They would have included the power to determine what service was essential to every State in this country. They would have included the power to determine whether or not there was discrimination in favor of A as against B.

That was what the Senate wanted; but what do the conferees want? The conferees have destroyed the initiative of the commission after one year, and put the initiative in the Secretary of Commerce, and leave the appellate authority in a commission whose members do not draw salaries, and who will be scattered to their homes. But suppose they do put it entirely in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce: Why should they take out of the hands of the Secretary of Commerce the power to investigate excessive charges, the power to investigate discriminations, the power to investigate monopoly, the power to investigate lack of service? Yet they have done it. They have expressly taken that power out of the hands of the licensing power and the power that revokes licenses.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. KING. As I understand this bill—and I ask for information; I am very much interested in the able presentation being made by the Senator—the charge is made, and I think with very much force, that there is a monopoly, or at least a potential monopoly, existing now in this important industry. This bill affords no means of restricting or curbing the monopoly. It is contemplated that these high-powered organizations that now have the licenses will charge the multitude for listening in; and, notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding the potential if not actual monopoly, this bill provides no means by which the public may be protected, and therefore is confirmation of the monopolistic power which already exists. Is that the interpretation of the Senator?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, let me read from the conference bill itself. Under the bill which passed the Senate there would be no question but that the commission had full power to investigate charges of discrimination, monopoly, lack of service, or any other wrong, and would have a right to revoke a license when they found any of those wrongs to exist. But let us see what is in the conference report bill. Section 14 of the conference bill states when licenses may be revoked. It mentions two or three things among the grounds on which they may be revoked, and provides:

Or whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any other Federal body in the exercise of authority conferred upon it by law, shall find and shall certify to the commission that any licensee bound so to do, has failed to provide reasonable facilities for the transmis-

sion of radio communications, or that any licensee has made any unjust and unreasonable charge, or has been guilty of any discrimination, either as to charge or as to service or has made or prescribed any unjust and unreasonable classification, regulation, or practice with respect to the transmission of radio communications or service.

* That, sir, is the provision of the conference bill that we are asked to adopt. In other words, the men who have charge of this industry under this bill are the members of the radio commission and the Secretary of Commerce. They are the ones who grant the licenses. They are the ones who determine when and if a license shall be revoked. The Interstate Commerce Commission has no power to revoke a license. Mind you, the very power upon which is imposed the duty to revoke a license if there is a wrong is not given the authority to investigate the wrong. Can there be any greater absurdity? The only reason a person can conceive of for such a provision is that it is intended to be made so difficult to find out the facts that nobody will ever find them out. Does not everyone know what would happen?

We will assume, for instance, that one of the radio fans who wires in here anonymously should find that he lived in a certain section of the country that was not being served by the superpower broadcasting company. Where would he make his protest? He would naturally write to the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Commerce would say, "I have no authority over that." Then he would write to the radio commission, and the radio commission would say, "We have no authority over that. You will have to lay your protest before the Interstate Commerce Commission." Then he would lay his protest before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and what would happen to him? There are protests before the Interstate Commerce Commission with regard to railroad discriminations that have been lying there for years and years. That is not the fault of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They are only a certain number of human beings, and they have imposed on them too much work. They are supposed to value all the railroads of this country. They are 10 years behind in that. They are supposed to settle every protest over a discrimination in freight rates in this country. There are thousands of cases of that kind pending. Yet by this conference bill we are asked to say to this poor, unfortunate human being out in the woods somewhere, who never can get any service, "Go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and file a protest, and try your case to see whether or not you are getting service."

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. Just wait a minute until I get through with this line of thought, unless the Senator wants me to talk all day, and I am not going to do that. I am going to finish, as I told the Senator.

Let me go just a little further. A preacher representing the church to which the Senator from Washington belongs desires to preach a sermon over the radio. He preaches the sermon over the radio, and his church is charged \$100 a minute. The preacher of another church goes to the broadcasting station and preaches, and he is charged \$100 for 10 minutes. Is that fair? That is a discrimination. Is there anything in this bill to prevent that?

Suppose the preacher representing the church of my friend from Washington should go to the Secretary of Commerce and say, "I have been treated unfairly. There has been a discrimination against me as to charges." The Secretary of Commerce would have to say, "I have no jurisdiction over the matter." Then he would go to the radio commission, and the members of the radio commission would say, "We have no jurisdiction over this matter. You will have to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission." He goes to the Interstate Commerce Commission and files his protest to the effect that he has been charged ten times as much as some other preacher for talking over the radio, with the use of exactly the same facilities. What happens? He may get a decision in 5 or 10 years, or the Radio Corporation of America may appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission and say, "There is no authority under existing law for you to fix rates on radio"; and there is a grave doubt as to whether there is. If there is any power under which the Interstate Commerce Commission can fix charges on radio, we know that they know nothing about radio, and they have not time to learn anything.

The thing that was wrong with this whole proposition was this: This new industry, this growing science, this far-reaching power, should be handled as we handle the railroads. We established an Interstate Commerce Commission to handle railroad questions, and yet the railroad problem had been with us for nearly a hundred years, and was a simple problem by comparison with this. What do we have to do with this problem? The conference bill would do everything on God's earth it could to confuse the problem. It has it messed with

by the Secretary of Commerce and fooled with by a body that draws no salary, called a radio commission, and neither one of them has jurisdiction to investigate and determine the most important disputes that will arise under the operation of radio.

Oh, yes; of course the radio broadcasters of this country want this bill passed. Does anyone doubt that? Do not Senators know that nearly every telephone company in the United States in every little town is getting some one to send a telegram saying, "Pass this bill"? What do the senders of those wires know about it? Why was it that just recently the broadcasting concerns of the West all changed their wave lengths, sometimes a hundred degrees, to have them conflict, and the next day said, "If you do not pass this bill, you will have that same condition for another year"? Why have we not had that for a year? Why does it happen just now?

Mr. President, I do not believe I am naturally suspicious, but when telegrams pour in from all over the United States to Senators from people who know nothing about this legislation, and can not know anything about it, urging its passage, I know the stimulus comes from somewhere, and where should the stimulus come from for the passage of this bill?

This bill is fair to only one institution. It is fair to the monopoly that will be created under it. The monopoly that may be created under it is practically free of control. There is nothing in the bill about charges, there is nothing in it about service, there is nothing in it about discrimination, unless a complainant goes to another body created by another law for another purpose and there makes his protest.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. DILL. I know the Senator does not want to make a misstatement. He says there is nothing in this bill that would empower the radio commission to compel radio broadcasters to give service. I think he did not mean to say that.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did mean to say that.

Mr. DILL. Then the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator can answer me in his own time.

Mr. DILL. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the whole basis of the bill is public service to the listeners in.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that statement of the Senator from Washington would be as absurd as this bill if the bill were not tragic. The whole basis of this bill is service? I know the Senator thinks that. Of course, he does. We all admire the honesty and the seriousness of the Senator from Washington. He believes that the whole basis of this bill is service, and I do not, and I am arguing my side of it.

I say that there is no legislative body on God's earth that was intending to give control of an industry such as this to a commission, or to the Secretary of Commerce, that would ever have prepared a bill like this. Can anyone think for one moment of saying there must be a powerful control over a future monopoly, and then not give to the party who is supposed to give the license and revoke the license the power to investigate monopoly, the power to investigate discrimination, the power to investigate overcharges, the power to investigate lack of service? Can we think of any legislative body creating a radio commission and not giving them the right to determine those questions?

We gave the power to the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroads to fix their rates. Of course, we did. We gave the power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel railroads to give exactly the same service and the same charges to every shipper. Read the interstate commerce act and you will find the power that we gave the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroads. Read this thing which the Senator says is based on service. The only service in this whole thing is service to a future monopoly; that is all.

It is the greatest outrage on the listeners-in of this country, because it allows the charging of any price, either directly or through a subterfuge of allowing the use of a patent. That is the outrage in that.

It would permit the monopoly to cut off the listeners of a whole section of the country if it saw fit to do it. It would allow them to select those who may use their broadcasting station as far as the regulatory body is concerned, as far as the Secretary of Commerce is concerned, or as far as the commission is concerned.

They do not even retain in this so-called regulatory body any power of limitation of the character of stuff that they will use the broadcasting facilities for. If you could have as many broadcasting stations as telephone companies, or if you could have as many broadcasting stations as railroad companies, competition would settle a great many things, but there are only 89 effective wave lengths, and the Secretary of Commerce, who is to become the primary mover in this control at the end of

one year, has already announced it as his opinion that the best service can be obtained through superbroadcasting stations.

As I said before, probably he is right. Perhaps the best service to the listeners-in can be obtained in that way. But when that idea is followed out, you cut out competition; there is no such thing as competition under those circumstances. Whenever you realize that you are building up something where there will be no competition, where there is a single power, you do not start in to grant that power, and not reserve definitely every power of control over it that is essential to the welfare and safety of the people of this country. It is not done.

Those behind this legislation are counting on passing it through a tremendous propaganda. They have thrown their thousands and hundreds of thousands of telegrams in on Senators advising them to vote for a bill about which the sender of the message knows nothing, and some Senators are paying attention to those telegrams and are not looking at the bill, because they do not want to look at it; they do not want to understand it.

There is one thing which you will find out, that if it becomes necessary to make money out of broadcasting, the broadcasting concerns, when they have sold all of the receiving sets they can, will shoot out through this country every night magnificent, interesting statements with regard to sausage and pig's feet. Why not? If they can be paid to broadcast advertising matter throughout the country, why should they not do it? It is fair to the broadcaster, but is it fair to the 15,000,000 people who have bought receiving sets? There should be some power in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce or the radio commission, or both of them, who have the power to grant and revoke licenses, to place some reasonable limitation on the use of the broadcasting stations so that they might be enjoyed by and be beneficial to the people of the country. But the conferees' bill does not propose to do any such thing.

Another proposition is this: It is made unlawful to intercept a message and to publish it without the consent of the sender. Such a law was enacted by Congress in connection with telegraph companies. A telegraph company is a different thing from a broadcasting company. A telegraph company owns its own wires. A broadcasting company owns nothing except the sending apparatus. What is the result? If they have no vested rights in the use of the ether, then that provision will absolutely fail. On the other hand, as I said, a great speech may be made by some statesman in England on some subject of world-wide interest and the broadcasting company of England may send it out to the Radio Corporation of America in New York. It may be intercepted by the New York Times or Herald or some of the other great papers of the country, but they would be prohibited under the provisions of the bill from publishing it without the consent of the sender. If we carry that proposition to its legitimate end throughout the country, let us see where we wind up.

Of course, the newspapers have announced that they intend to violate any such absurd proposition. But when we are constructing a law of this importance, dealing with one of the great powers which has so recently come into existence, one which we have just discovered, why should we not give some thought to it? Why should we not realize that it is bound to be a monopoly and that the power in the hands of that monopoly, unless it is under the strictest control, may be used for the oppression of the people of the country?

Mr. President, this thing is an outrage. I want to read into the Record a part of the various bills, not for the benefit of the present but for the future, because there is going to be a future and a terrible future from the effect of the provisions of the bill.

What was provided in the House bill with regard to title when it came over to the Senate? Mind you, when the bill was considered in the House Committee on Interstate Commerce the committee came to the conclusion not only that the Government was the exclusive controller of the ether but that it should be asserted as such controller and that we should assert our right over it so that no private corporation or individual could obtain any vested right in the use of the ether or wave channels as against the United States.

Here is what the House bill provided and here is what the House of Representatives adopted unanimously:

That it is hereby declared and reaffirmed that the ether, within the limits of the United States, its Territories and possessions, is the inalienable possession of the people thereof.

Is there any such declaration in the conferees' bill? There is nothing of the sort that I can find. Let us go a little further. The bill came over to the Senate and was referred to

the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate and here is what that committee put in the bill. It is found in section 24 of the Senate bill:

That the Federal Government intends forever to preserve and maintain the channels of radio transmission as a perpetual medium under the control and for the people of the United States.

Is there any language like that in the conferees' bill? I wonder why the conferees objected to that language. I would like to know why. Here was a great House committee which adopted that language. Here was the whole House which adopted that language. Here was a great committee of the United States Senate which adopted it, and here was the Senate itself which adopted it. Why was it not satisfactory to the conferees on behalf of those two bodies? The reason why it was not satisfactory was because, they have stated, it was urged that it was unconstitutional. Eternal heavens, here were six conferees on the part of the two Houses listening to evidence and matter that came out after the bill had passed both Houses, listening to some lawyer possibly on behalf of the Radio Corporation of America claiming that we can not leave that kind of an assertion in the bill because it is asserting something unconstitutional. Would it not be well, when both of the bodies and two of their great committees have asserted the title of the United States and its superior right to the ether, to leave that language in the bill and let the Supreme Court of the United States decide that it was an unconstitutional allegation, if we ever wanted to do it?

Going a little further, there seemed to be a great fear of stepping on some of the constitutional rights of the broadcaster. We will turn now to the waiver provision. In the Senate bill the Senate committee and the Senate evidently had some purpose in requiring that a waiver should be contained in the license. They had some purpose in doing that. There is no doubt what the purpose was. They knew there were certain attorneys for the broadcasting companies who were contending that we could not put them out of business, who were contending we had to give them a license. We know that we can not give all of them licenses. Somebody has to be denied a license, and unless we have some authority beyond regulatory power, unless we have a prior right in the ether, we can not stop a company that is operating; so we put in this safeguard. We knew that we wanted to license some of them, and we said to them, "When you take out a license you must sign a waiver." What was that waiver?

No license shall be granted until the applicant either for a license or for a renewal of a license has signed, under oath, a waiver of any claim of right to any wave length or to the use of the ether because of any previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise.

That provision was in the Senate bill, and it was adopted by the Senate, but what happened when it got to conference? The conferees do not have the broadcasters waive any claim of right as against the United States, but they must waive a right of claim against the "regulatory power" of the United States. Instead of waiving any claim as against the title of the United States, they only waive a claim as against the right of the United States to regulate.

Everyone who has the slightest knowledge of constitutional law knows that the Supreme Court has held time and time again the absolute power of the Federal Government to regulate common carriers in interstate commerce. Why should we want a waiver of that power? What we want them to waive is any claim of a vested right to the use of the ether or wave channel, because they have been using either. We want them to waive that claim because we do not want any litigation.

A railroad company may sign a waiver against the regulatory rights of the United States, but it does not sign a waiver of title. If there were dispute over a right of way and the Government would say, "Before we grant you certain privileges you will have to waive any claim of title as against the United States of that right of way," that would be a matter of title; but when they waive any claim of right against the regulatory power of the United States they are waiving nothing, because there is no dispute over that right at all.

For instance, the radio commission under the terms of the bill may find it necessary to cut out of the State of New York 100 broadcasting stations, which have been operating two years. What question then arises? Is it a question of power to regulate? No; that question does not arise. If they want to cut out those hundred stations, they must say, "No; we are not going to give you a license; we are not going to let you operate; we are going to put you out of business." What power has the United States Government to put them out of business? Does the regulatory power give the Government the right to take

their property? Certainly not. The power to regulate must be reasonable; the power to regulate can not be confiscatory.

We can not take property away from a person through the power of regulation. We can not, through the power of regulation, stop a railroad which is operating. We can not stop 100 broadcasting concerns in New York from operating by the power of regulation. The only way we can stop them is to have inalienable control over the ether that surrounds the country. If we have not got that power, we can not stop them; and yet the bill intends to stop some of them. It means to stop some of them if the regulations are to be of any consequence at all. But they have emasculated the waiver provision in the Senate bill by putting in the words "regulatory power" when the waiver was originally against claim of title. They not only cut out of the conference bill the two assertions of title which were in the House bill and the Senate bill, respectively, but they cut out the waiver powers to conform to it. It seems to me that this was evidently reviewed by a very able lawyer before it was finally adopted.

Let us see what was in the Senate bill with regard to revocation. I am reading from section 8. This gives the ground on which the radio commission may revoke a license, and it is not in the conference bill. Here is what was provided in the Senate bill. A license may be revoked when—

any licensee bound so to do has failed to provide reasonable facilities for the transmission of radio communications, or has made any unjust and unreasonable charge, or has been guilty of any discrimination, either as to charge or as to service, or has made or prescribed any unjust or unreasonable classification, regulation, or practice with respect to the transmission of radio communications or service.

That was the power of the radio commission under the Senate bill. If the conferees wanted to give power to the Secretary of Commerce, why did they not transfer that same power to him? But no, they did not do it. They did not even transfer the power to the Interstate Commerce Commission. They still left the power of revoking to the original radio commission or Secretary of Commerce, but under the terms of the conference bill they can not investigate these charges. They can not make any findings under the conference bill. They can not take any action whatever until after the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have found that the charges are well founded:

Listen to what we provided in the Senate bill with regard to listeners-in. This is subdivision (k) under Article C:

(k) Regulate and control any and all methods of transmitting energy, communications, or signals by radio where a charge is made to the listeners by the use of any apparatus, device, or connection by wire, and prohibit all unjust and unreasonable charges to listeners.

There was provided a commission with a proper power to protect listeners-in. Now the power to protect listeners-in is given to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has no power to revoke a license.

A provision to protect States appeared in identical language in both the House bill and the Senate bill. I read from subdivision (d), paragraph C, as follows:

(d) Determine the location of classes of stations or individual stations (with due consideration of the right of each State to have allocated to it, or to some person, firm, company, or corporation within it, the use of a wave length for at least one broadcasting station located or to be located in such State, whenever application may be made therefor) and the kind of apparatus to be used with respect to its external effects.

In the House bill the right of a State was to be enforced by the Secretary of Commerce, and in the Senate bill that right was to be enforced by the radio commission; but the rights of the States were set forth in identical language; and yet the conferees in preparing their bill have absolutely left that out entirely. There is no provision whatever of that kind included.

Now let me call the attention of Senators to the provisions which deal with the commission. As I have before stated, paragraph B of the Senate bill provided for the creation of a commission to control this industry. That commission was to consist of five men, bipartisan, to be appointed from five separate zones in the United States, the zones taking in the whole country. In the conference bill we find that section 5 as prepared by the conferees does this to the commission:

SEC. 5. From and after one year after the first meeting of the commission created by this act, all the powers and authority vested in the commission under the terms of this act, except as to the revocation of licenses, shall be vested in and exercised by the Secretary of Commerce; except that thereafter the commission shall have power and jurisdiction to act upon and determine any and all matters brought before it under the terms of this section.

Then follow certain things which may be brought to the attention of the commission by the Secretary of Commerce. So the result of the situation is that the Senate has failed to obtain what it most sought, which was the absolute control of a future monopoly by a bipartisan, permanent, intelligent, well-informed commission; it has lost that, and that power goes to the Secretary of Commerce. The present Secretary of Commerce is an admirable man and no doubt would exercise these duties with great ability, but even Secretaries of Commerce change. He may be promoted and, of course, there is a possibility that he may be demoted. It is not necessary to deal with those possibilities. The fact is that an unstable body is being created in this bill. Then, after having destroyed the chief thing that the Senate fought for, which was the commission, and having given the power to the Secretary of Commerce, it is proposed to strike from the hands of the Secretary of Commerce and the commission the essential power to investigate monopolies and discriminations, overcharges, and lack of service, which was provided for in the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I have no desire to destroy this proposed legislation; I never have tried to destroy it, and that fact would have been known except for the misrepresentations that have been scattered over the country by those who are trying to intimidate us into passing ill-advised legislation.

I first offered a motion directing that the bill be recommitted to the conferees and that the House be asked for a further conference. That motion was defeated. I then argued the point of order that the conferees had no right to eliminate identical sections in the House and Senate bills. In the whole time that this subject has been before the Senate an examination of my remarks will show that I have not taken up on the floor over two hours in my time. It is true, when I first raised this question many Senators asked me to yield, not for the purpose of interrogating me but for the purpose in my time of interrogating the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]. There has been no filibuster on this matter; but I have attempted to induce the Senate to reconsider what I believe to be very unfortunate legislation.

It will not kill the bill to have the conference report go back to the House of Representatives and ask for a further conference with that body. That is not an unusual proceeding. We have had several conference reports come before the Senate in the last week or two as to which that very procedure has been followed, and the Senate has asked for a further conference with the other House. Why should we not do so in this instance? The bill could have gone back to the conferees two weeks ago, when the matter first came up, and a new report could have been submitted to the House and to the Senate by this time. Why has not that been done? Is it because the conferees believe this bill is perfect, or is it because they believe the House will not yield anything? I know well enough that the Senator from Washington does not believe the bill is perfect because he did more than anyone else to prepare the Senate bill which has been emasculated in the conference report which is now before us, and he can not believe that bill is perfect. If he believes that the House of Representatives will not yield anything, then I have no sympathy with that position, because it is our duty to ask the House to consider things that are reasonable. Not in a spirit of criticism of this particular matter, but in comment upon the general tendency of conferees of the Senate, may I say that too frequently in the last few years we have had conferees come back here after having abandoned the crucial principles for which we fought in this body, on the ground that if we did not take what the House conferees would give we could not get anything. That argument carries no weight whatever with me. I think sometimes we had better get nothing than to take things that are dangerous in their construction and in their effect.

I would not be standing here arguing this question if I did not consider certain provisions in the conference report dangerous. I think the confusion that exists now will be as molehill to a mountain by comparison to that which will exist a year from now if this conference bill passes as it is. I feel pretty confident that the listeners-in in this country are now just entering that stage where they have got to suffer for their ignorance with regard to this legislation in their servitude to the very interests which are going to impose on them; but such an experience may be necessary.

The idea of a man telegraphing me from my State saying, "The radio bill is a good bill; vote for it." I know he does not know what is in the radio bill; I know that he has never seen it, and the chances are if he saw it he would not know what it meant, as it is very complicated. That character of petition is disgusting; it is not the character of petition that was contemplated in the Constitution of the United States; it is not the

character of petition that should have influence upon any man who is worthy to sit in this body.

WAR SITUATION IN MEXICO

Mr. HEFLIN resumed the speech begun by him yesterday. The entire speech is as follows:

Mr. President, I agree with a great deal that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] has said. My State has not been treated right in this matter, and I want time to talk to the Members in charge of this measure before we take a vote on it.

I am going to discuss now a measure in which the people of the United States are more interested than they are in a few public buildings.

Every indication in the press now is to the effect that war is coming on. Nicaragua is setting the stage. The Washington Post is breathing out the prophecies of war. On yesterday morning we find in the Post this article from Nicaragua:

February 14.—An automobile flying the American flag, in which Lawrence Dennis, the American chargé, and the correspondent of the Associated Press had traveled from Managua to Matagalpa was fired on during the disturbance. No one in the automobile was injured, although one bullet lodged in the upholstery.

I have seen so many of these war programs laid down that I believe I know them when I see them. I predict that a little more and more articles like that will appear, and when Congress adjourns and the people's representatives have gone home, as I said before, something will happen here at Washington or down there, and the matter will have proceeded so far that probably there will be nothing to do but to go to war with Mexico, as the Knights of Columbus planned in Philadelphia last August.

Here is an editorial from Mr. Ed McLean's paper here in Washington, in which this language is used:

In view of the constant danger to Americans and other foreigners for whom the United States is responsible, it would seem necessary to take a further step. The revolutionists should be commanded to quit.

What business is it of ours what government they set up down there? They are fighting amongst themselves. Why have we gone down there with our implements of war?

Again, Mr. President, in that paper it is said:

The half-way measures thus far taken by the United States are not bringing peace in Nicaragua.

What does that mean but a suggestion for war?

On January 14 I made a speech upon this subject, just after the New York World, in an editorial of the 13th, had said that the people of the United States are more nearly in war with Mexico than they have any idea.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senators on the other side of the aisle, if they want to carry on conversation, will go to the cloakroom. I am discussing a matter in which ninety-odd millions of people are interested, and they have to rely upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to get the absolute truth as to what transpires here. Some of the press is free, and some of these boys who write for the press are honest; but they cut down their reports, and so garble them that the people do not get what transpires here. It is an awful and a sad and a lamentable situation that we labor under at the Capitol when special privilege is back of a movement that the Representatives of the people oppose.

I have been slandered and vilified because I dared to speak against the program of the Knights of Columbus, citizens of the United States. Why should I not speak about the Knights of Columbus if they are doing something that they ought not to do? Why should I not speak about them as I should about any other class of American citizens? What is it about their peculiar relation to some foreign potentate and power that makes them so extremely sensitive that they are ready to denounce, in the vilest language they can employ, a United States Senator who dares to denounce their efforts to plunge us into war?

I never had the slightest conception of the political activities of the Catholic clergy, of the Catholic hierarchy, of the Knights of Columbus, until I raised this issue in behalf of my country. The Catholic press from one end of the country to the other has assailed me, slandered me, vilified me, because I have dared to bring to the light a deep-laid plan to involve my country in war at the instance of the Knights of Columbus, speaking for the Catholic hierarchy of the United States.

I am going to undertake to prove my case to-day, and I am going to leave it to sympathetic Senators—and they are here, three-fourths of them—as to whether or not I prove my case; and I am going to leave it to the 100 per cent American people,

Jew and gentile, who do not want war with Mexico, as to whether or not I prove my case.

I want to read, in the outset, a statement made by a Mr. Flaherty. He is the supreme head of the Knights of Columbus of the United States. This statement appeared in the Washington Post on January 15, after I had spoken on the 14th. Here is his language:

The Knights of Columbus do not urge intervention in Mexico. The Knights of Columbus do not plead for the United States help for the Catholic Church in Mexico. The issue is not the Catholic Church.

Now let me submit the proof.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Bruce] is the first Protestant American Senator to denounce me upon this floor for raising a religious issue which I never raised. He deplored the fact that I had dared to bring to this floor this question, when all I did was to read from the resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus their purpose to involve us in war—a resolution which denounced the American Government for the position it had taken toward Mexico; a resolution which told the President, "Watchful waiting is a thing of the past; we demand action." What is that action except war? When peaceful means are no longer employed, war is resorted to.

I showed that at that meeting in Philadelphia the religious question was the main question considered. I showed that a few weeks after that resolution was adopted Bishop Dougherty, a Catholic of Philadelphia, congratulated the Knights of Columbus for having waked up a portion of the people who apparently had been dormant, and notified them that they could not mistreat Catholics or treat Catholics with indifference. The Catholic idea was back of it all. The Catholic idea runs through it all. It was a Catholic movement from the outset, and I am going to prove it to-day by their own utterances.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Bruce] was the first to come forward; and then the big voice from Missouri came in and had to express his views and announce his candidacy for the Presidency, hoping to get the Catholic hierarchy to support him. But back to Maryland: God bless that old State! I have loved it from my youth time. I regret to see the Senator from Maryland taking the stand that he is taking against an American Senator who is fighting an interest which would involve his country in war.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRUCE. I should just like to say that I regret that the feeling of affection which the Senator entertains for Maryland, I am afraid, is a case of unreciprocated affection.

Mr. HEFLIN. I deny that. I can beat the Senator in the State of Maryland to-day. That is a broad statement, but I can defeat him myself in the State of Maryland. If the Senator knew how low his stock has gone politically in the last two or three weeks, we would not hear much more from him in this Chamber. So I deny that the Senator speaks for Maryland in regard to that. Hundreds of letters from his State have endorsed my course. Citizens of his State have even written to me swearing that if I was harmed others would die to pay the penalty. When a man is willing to die for you, he cares something about you and the fight that you are making.

But let me get back to the issue; and let Senators listen to this, and the press gallery, too, because it would be glorious news to the country, in view of the Senator's stand that I had injected the religious issue:

Knights of Columbus, Maryland State Council, Baltimore, Md., March 25, 1926.

Preceding the convention in Maryland.

To the honorable the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives—

And so forth.

Subject: Resolutions of protest against religious persecution in Mexico, from the Knights of Columbus of the State of Maryland.

Whereas the Government of the United States has admitted Mexico and its Government into its circle of international friendship and continues to recognize this Government, in spite of its indecent and degrading acts toward priests and sisters of the Catholic Church and its efforts to destroy the Catholic Church in Mexico; and

Whereas decent and liberty-loving citizens of the United States can hope for no relief from this unjust and degrading spectacle, from this or any other administration in Mexico, because the persecution of Catholics and the plan to destroy the Catholic Church in Mexico is provided for in the provisions of the Mexican constitution of 1917—

And so forth.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Knights of Columbus of Maryland, That we, as citizens of the United States, do earnestly protest against the continued recognition of the Government of Mexico.

GEORGE R. CALLIS, Jr., *State Deputy.*

WILLIAM H. TIBBETS, *State Secretary.*

Now, let me submit some more proof along that line. Here is a statement of a Catholic priest of Washington, Priest Ripple.

I read:

Statement of Rev. Father M. J. Ripple, Holy Name Society.

A religious and Catholic institution. Priest Ripple says:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want to keep you more than a few minutes. I am the national director of the Holy Name Society, concerning which you have all heard, which enjoys a membership of 6,500 organizations, with a total membership of about 2,000,000 men.

Catholic institutions. He is speaking only for Catholics.

The men of the Holy Name Society have instructed me to register their protest against the laws of Mexico; against recognition by this Government of Mexico.

There is a Catholic priest claiming to speak for 2,000,000 Catholics regarding the religious situation in Mexico.

Let me read again from the hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which, strange to say—and I want the country to know it—have never been printed. Hundreds of requests have come for this document, and people have not been allowed to read it. It has been tucked away in the House committee until to-day when I got hold of the hearings, and I am now reading from them. I am giving what transpired at the beginning, and showing you who was supporting the resolution declaring for a severance of diplomatic relations with Mexico—a resolution introduced by a Roman Catholic, Mr. BOYLAN, of New York. These hearings were had upon that resolution, and since certain Senators have accused me of injecting the religious issue, I am going to establish to the satisfaction of every honest man that the religious issue raised in this Mexican situation was not raised by me, but that they raised it, and that it was and has been a Catholic move from the beginning.

Here is another statement filed with the House committee, referring to letters and telegrams representing the Holy Name Societies mentioned by the Catholic priest, Ripple. After compiling figures, it is said:

These figures total 1,656,711, with branches numbering 3,960.

Remember, these are all Catholic religious organizations.

This forms the protest of the Holy Name Society against laws against religious liberty in the Mexican situation.

Let me read again:

March 28, 1926. Minot, N. Dak. Rev. Michael Ripple—

That is the priest here in Washington, to whom all these telegrams were sent here in Washington—

515 Sixth Street SW., Washington, D. C., whereas during the past year—

Mr. President, before I read that, let me say that there was concerted action between these societies and this priest in Washington, there can be no doubt, because they all sent their telegrams on the same day urging this action before the House committee on that very day, and this is one of the communications addressed to this priest requesting him to enter their protest to the committee.

I read:

Whereas during the past year the Government of Mexico has supported and protected a well-organized movement for the persecution and destruction of the Catholic faith in Mexico—

And so on. Then again:

Be it resolved by the members of St. Leo's Catholic Church of Minot, N. Dak., consisting of some 1,200 members, That the congressional committee of our Government before whom this matter is now pending do vigorously protest against further persecution of the Catholic faith in Mexico and demand of said Government freedom of religious belief, and upon failure of such Government to comply therewith that such committee do recommend the immediate severance of diplomatic relations between our Government and the Government of Mexico.

ST. LEO'S CONGREGATION OF MINOT, N. DAK.

What does that establish, Mr. President?

These letters are not coming in from citizens generally, and they are not asking that the protests be read in the names of "American citizens." They are asking that the protests of the

members of the Catholic Church be read, and that is what was done at the hearings before the House committee.

Let me submit some excerpts from an interesting document, the Western Christian Advocate:

A widely known student of Mexican affairs, who has spent 10 years in close touch with the movements of our neighboring Republic, declared last week that there were three forces which would welcome a war against Mexico—certain of the oil interests, certain of the land interests, and the Roman Catholic Church. It would hardly seem that a church claiming to represent Christ would urge nations into acts of unfriendliness and violence. Not a single Protestant coming out of Mexico whom we have questioned has stated that the Government there is carrying on opposition to Christianity or to religious schools as such. Yet at this very hour Roman Catholic representatives in Congress are endeavoring to have this country break relations with Mexico on these grounds.

Let me read some more in this connection from the hearings which have been hid away from the public in a House committee. Bishop Matthews, a Roman Catholic bishop, closes his statement to the committee by protesting against brutal treatment received by priests and nuns in Mexico. Is he not raising the Catholic question?

Now, I want to read a statement from the Knights of Columbus pamphlet called "Red Mexico," which they are sending throughout the country. By the way, I have received probably two dozen copies of that pamphlet from the South in the last two or three days, one gentleman writing across the back of the pamphlet, "The South is being flooded with this pamphlet." Remember, that pamphlet is still being sent broadcast, even since the Senate passed a resolution declaring in favor of arbitrating our differences with Mexico.

The Knights of Columbus in their resolution at Philadelphia pledged their continued effort along the lines indicated by that resolution, aid to the Knights of Columbus of Mexico, and these pamphlets being sent out now indicate that they are keeping their promise to continue their propaganda in spite of the stand taken by the Government of the United States.

In the Knights of Columbus pamphlet called "Red Mexico," now being circulated throughout the South, I find this language on page 24:

Heretofore there has been a disposition to look upon this as a controversy between the Catholic Church and the Mexican Government.

On page 28 we find the language I shall read directly from a gentleman who says he is non-Catholic. I said before, and am going to repeat, Mr. President, that I never knew of the intricate workings of the Catholic hierarchy until this issue arose; I never knew how completely they dominated and controlled certain weak-kneed Protestants until this question came up. A gentleman wrote me a letter, which I have read into the RECORD heretofore, in which he stated that frequently the Catholics would vote for a weak-kneed Protestant because they could use him for certain purposes better than they could use a Catholic, and when one of them rises and declares that he is a Protestant and straightway proceeds to carry out their propaganda to do their bidding, I have my opinion as to the kind of Protestant American he is.

This man, who says he is a non-Catholic, in an article in this pamphlet, has this to say about the situation down in Mexico:

Calles is on top—

Referring to the President of Mexico—

and he is grinding the faces of the Catholics in the grit because he can, and he does not like them anyway.

Listen to this, Senators:

If the Mexican Catholics were in the driver's seat, they would be putting the bud to Calles as he is lacing it into them.

Here is an admission that the Roman Catholics want this Government to help them get the upper hand of Calles, and what do these resolutions speak of? Persecution of the Catholic Church. From whom are these protests coming? Societies of the Catholic Church. Who is wiring to Washington to report out the resolution of Mr. BOYLAN? Catholic priests throughout the country. Who later initiated the move and started on a nation-wide drive to force this Government to break diplomatic relations with Mexico? The Knights of Columbus of the United States. And because I brought into the Senate a resolution they passed, which suggested a course that would inevitably result in the killing of many American boys in an unjustified war, I have been accused of injecting into this matter a religious discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished busi-

ness, which is the conference report on House bill No. 9971, the radio bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I was about to say that because I, an American Senator from a sovereign State, dared to come into this Chamber and bring the written evidence of an effort to involve us in war by a secret order of the Catholic Church, I was pounced upon by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. Of course, I did not expect anything except that those who belonged to the Roman Catholic Church would say something. If they had not said something probably they would have been lectured severely by those in authority over them. But for these other two Senators to stand here and undertake to lecture me because I had discussed a question involving the activities of members of the Roman Catholic Church seemed out of place and entirely inappropriate. Are there any questions affecting this Government and the lives of its citizens that can not be discussed in the Senate of the United States? The intolerance I have seen displayed on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy and on the part of the Roman Catholic press toward me has convinced me that if there were 60 Catholic Senators in this body I could not make the speech I am making to-day, nor could I have made the speech I made here a few days ago. If they had a majority of Roman Catholic Senators in this Chamber, the Roman Catholic hierarchy would call on them to expunge my speech from the RECORD. I believe that as I live and God reigns.

I have never come in contact with such a narrow-minded, intolerant, and bigoted bunch as the Roman Catholic clergy and the Roman Catholic press. The mildest language they use toward me is denouncing me as a liar and a bigoted ass. One of their papers, the Irish World, started out by saying that "Senator REED answered HEFLIN's lies." They are feeding that kind of intemperate and slanderous stuff to the country. I have not told any falsehood on them. I have told the plain truth, and there are not enough of them in the United States to prevent me from continuing to give that truth to the country. They may do something to me, as they have done to other men who have crossed their paths and interfered with their plans, but if they do I will go down to death with the conscious feeling that I died in the service of my country. The people who have followed my course will know that I was assassinated because I was serving my country and seeking to protect it against the enemies of my country. Let me read now what was said in the resolution referred to a moment ago. This resolution was filed with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, adopted by the Ascension Branch of the Holy Name Society of the Archdiocese of New York, from Al Smith's home State, and I will have something to say about that gentleman before I finish my remarks. On the Mexican situation it said, in part, in the preamble:

Whereas the Republic of Mexico has enacted laws which in effect deny property rights and religious liberty and freedom of conscience and declare the property owned by persons engaged in teaching religion to be the property of the public; and

Whereas among those deprived of these rights are a large number of Catholics—

And so forth.

Why, Mr. President, have I raised a religious issue? Who started this move to involve us in war with Mexico? Who introduced that House resolution? A Catholic Member of Congress. Who sent their messages of support by telegrams to be presented to the House committee? Catholic religious societies. Who wrote the resolution at Philadelphia? The Knights of Columbus, a Roman Catholic organization. Who raised a million dollars to carry on their propaganda against the announced course of this Government with regard to Mexico? The Catholic Knights of Columbus. Who is flooding the country now with pamphlets on "Red Mexico," assailing and contradicting the Government's position and its information on the subject? The Knights of Columbus.

When they brought out the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE]—"Old Pericles," as I sometimes call him—they thought they had trotted out the ablest scholar and the most classical gentleman among their friends in the Senate to deliver a rebuke to a plain Democratic patriot from another one of the sovereign States, who had dared to speak about the un-American conduct of some of his constituents. I never dreamed that the resolution written by the Knights of Columbus in his own State would furnish me the proof needed to annihilate the untenable position of the Senator from Maryland. I have read it here. The resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus of Maryland raised the religious issue. They protested against the persecution of Roman Catholic priests and nuns and against the efforts to destroy the Catholic Church. And yet the Senator from Maryland said that I injected the religious issue; but

I did not do it. The Knights of Columbus of the Senator's own State raised in their resolution the religious issue. The Senator from Maryland and the snow-white-haired Senator from Missouri, JAMES A. REED, came in and they both looked very solemn and grave and both undertook to deliver a lecture to me for bringing into the discussion a religious issue. Who injected the religious issue? Here it is in the resolution which I have read. Whose movement is it? It is not that of the Jews. They are against war with Mexico. They indorse my position. It is not that of the Protestants. They are against it. They indorse my position. In fact, all denominations except the Roman Catholics, so far as I know, are against war with Mexico. Mr. President, this is purely and wholly, singly and solely, a Catholic movement, and I have shown it by their resolutions which I have read as presented in the hearings in the House of Representatives on the Boylan resolution, which seeks to have this Government back off from the position it has taken and break diplomatic relations with the Republic of Mexico.

I read again the resolution from which I was reading. I found this resolution in the files of the hearings on the Boylan resolution before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, with the notation at the top "Introduce this." I read:

Whereas the present authorities in Mexico have inaugurated a policy which has for its object not only the destruction of the Catholic faith, but the wiping out of all religion among the people of that country; and

Whereas in pursuance of that policy, church property has been confiscated, innocent nuns and venerable priests have been driven from that country—

And so forth.

Mr. President, inch by inch and step by step I am proving that this whole thing is a Catholic move in the interest of the Catholic Church in Mexico. I ask the American people to be the judges, to sit as a jury to decide the question as to who brought the religious question into this Mexican situation.

Again I found this resolution from the State council of the Knights of Columbus of the State of Minnesota, May 25, 1926, shortly after the Philadelphia convention of the Knights of Columbus, in which it said:

Whereas the said articles of the Mexican constitution for some unaccountable reason are now being enforced in a ruthless and diabolical persecution of clergy and laity of the Catholic Church—

And so forth.

Sensors, would you think there was a religious body in the United States which would indulge in the vicious and slanderous attacks they have made upon me in their press, when the only thing I have done was to tell the naked truth about their conduct in this Mexican situation? I will tell you why they attack me. They are doing it for two reasons—to intimidate me and to frighten you. They want to impress you with the power and the vengeance of the Roman Catholic clergy. They want to impress you with their determination to crush anybody who dares to stand up in the open and question the programs of the Pope. There is no getting around that fact.

I found in the files of the hearings a letter on the letter from 21 Park Road, New York, dated March 30, 1926, and addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: Permit me to express my indignation at the treatment of Mexican and American Catholics by the American Government and to strongly urge your committee to recommend that the United States sever diplomatic relations with Mexico.

Very respectfully yours,

FRANCIS X. DINEEN.

I also found this letter:

WASHINGTON, April 29, 1926.

HON. JAMES J. CONNOLLY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONNOLLY: This office is in receipt of your letter of the 24th accompanied by a number of communications received by you in protest against the "religious" persecution in Mexico and asking that our Government intercede in the matter—

And so forth.

Yours truly,

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE.

I have read from Mr. Flaherty's statement where he said they did not want any interference; that they wanted no intervention and wanted no help for the Catholic Church. He is the head of the Knights of Columbus.

Now, Mr. President, let me read some more interesting letters, telegrams, and resolutions.

I have shown that Judge Talley, a Roman Catholic, an able judge in New York, came before that committee and said that he was speaking only for the members of the Catholic Church in the city of New York, the Catholic laity. None but Catholics have appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to urge war with Mexico; none but them have gone on record protesting against the government of Calles in Mexico. Then, why should four or five Senators here undertake to deceive the public and misrepresent the facts by accusing me of injecting the religious issue into this Mexican situation? Truth can not yet be suppressed in the Senate of the United States; and I pray God the day will never come when an American Senator worthy of the name will fear to stand in his place in this body and say what the facts justify him in saying about the Catholic hierarchy, about Protestant churches, about Jewish churches, about any other church beneath the Stars and Stripes. Is not that good Americanism? I do not want the friendship of anybody here or elsewhere who does not believe that it is.

Let me remind you again just here what Mr. Flaherty, head of the Knights of Columbus, said:

The Knights of Columbus do not urge intervention in Mexico. The Knights of Columbus do not plead for the United States to help the Catholic Church in Mexico. The issue is not the Catholic Church.

Here is a statement by Francis J. Sullivan, of New York, in a letter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Let me say that I, as president, write you on behalf of the Brooklyn Alumni Sodality, an aggregation of 200 Catholic men in Brooklyn, N. Y.

And so forth. He is a Catholic writing in behalf of Catholics. Here is another letter:

ST. IGNATIUS HOLY NAME SOCIETY,
Hicksville, Long Island.

HON. ROBERT L. BACON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This society, composed of 182 members, wishes you as Representative of this district to protest against the treatment accorded to Catholics in Mexico by the Calles government.

A. PAUL STABLER, Secretary.

Here the religious issue is raised again.

Here is what Mr. BACON, the man to whom they were writing, indorsed on the paper:

A petition of the St. Ignatius Holy Name Society protesting against the action of Mexico in the treatment accorded to Catholics.

That is his statement, and that was filed with the committee.

Referred to Foreign Affairs.

Justice Joseph T. Ryan, of New York, in a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Boylan resolution, says:

Our Government should withdraw its approbation of the so-called Mexican constitution, particularly with respect to its unjust, un-American provisions relative to religion.

That looks like it is a religious issue. If it is, who injected it? Who raised the religious issue? These letters were written long before the Knights of Columbus acted at Philadelphia; long before I had any knowledge of what steps were being taken by these people to involve our country in war. Listen to this, Senators: Charles T. Rice, attorney, 110 West Forty-second Street, New York City, said in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House:

As a citizen of the United States and resident of New York City, I want to enter a very strong protest against the treatment which the present Mexican Government has meted out to the Roman Catholic institutions and orders.

I am anxious to see what kind of report the press will give this speech on to-morrow. I am anxious to know how much of this truth they will give to the country.

I am afraid that they will refuse to give to the public the astounding truths that I am bringing to the attention of the Senate to-day.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will yield for a question. I had hoped the Senator from Arizona would not get into this.

Mr. ASHURST. I can not refrain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama yields for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. The press ought to say in response to the Senator's invitation that they saw a man windy and foggy at the same time.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is about what I would expect from the wind-jamming Senator from Arizona. The only contribution that he could make to this discussion is wind; he has made it and I trust he feels better.

I have here some more letters showing that the Roman Catholic religion is back of this whole thing.

202 E. MADISON STREET,
Philadelphia, April 14, 1926.

HON. JAMES J. CONNOLLY,

Congressman from Pennsylvania.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a loyal citizen, I, with thousands of others from our great State of Pennsylvania, strongly protest against the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico by that tyrannical Government.

I will say for the benefit of the Senator from Arizona that I started my speech by stating that I had not raised the religious issue. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] accused me of that; but for nearly an hour, by resolutions of Holy Name societies, by messages from Catholic priests, by the resolution of the Knights of Columbus of Maryland, all speaking of the Catholic religion and of the Catholic Church, and by letters and telegrams to the Committee on Foreign Affairs supporting a resolution introduced by a Roman Catholic Representative in Congress, I am showing by the facts that not I, but that they, the Roman Catholic clergy, the Catholic hierarchy, and the Knights of Columbus have raised this issue. However, since they have raised it, and since they have turned loose their venom upon me in a lying press, I intend to give the whole truth to the country. The people should know the truth; they are entitled to know it; and I am entitled to place the truth of my position before them, and I intend to do it.

Here is another interesting letter I read:

As a loyal citizen, I, with thousands of others from our great State of Pennsylvania, strongly protest against the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico by that tyrannical government. Will you not use your kind offices for the purpose of inducing our Government to denounce such outrages?

Yours respectfully,

JOHN F. HERRON.

I read another letter as follows:

431 LOCUST STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In common with thousands of other loyal citizens of this great State of Pennsylvania, I wish to register a strong protest against the persecution of Catholics in Mexico by that tyrannical government.

Then the same expression follows—

Will you not use your kind offices—

And so forth. Here is another letter. This is also addressed to Mr. CONNOLLY.

3127 LONGSHORE STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an American and Roman Catholic, I protest against the barbarous treatment being given the Mexican Catholics by the Mexican Government.

In the face of these unchallenged facts no brave man, no honest man, will charge me with injecting the religious issue into the Mexican situation. The last letter was signed by Catherine Ryan. Here is another letter from Philadelphia, dated April 14, 1926, addressed to Hon. JAMES CONNOLLY:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a loyal citizen of Pennsylvania, I wish to protest strongly against the religious persecution now taking place in Mexico. As I am a firm believer in religious toleration as extended to us by our Constitution, I earnestly request you to use your influence in bringing about a strong protest from our Government to that of Mexico denouncing such barbarism.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH V. LAMBERT.

All of them are touching on and raising nothing but the religious question—the Catholic religious question. Here is another letter. It is addressed to the same Representative.

3155 LIVINGSTON STREET,
Philadelphia, April 15, 1926.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE: A most sincere protest against the persecution of Catholics in Mexico comes from me and thousands of others. Therefore I beseech you to do all in your power to put a stop to these atrocious activities.

Yours respectfully,

THOMAS FAURAK.

Another letter from Philadelphia, addressed to the same Representative, reads:

I make an appeal to you to try by means of your influence to induce the Government to denounce such barbarous tactics such as the Government of Mexico is exercising upon the Catholics of that territory.

Respectfully,

CLARA E. DOUGHERTY.

She has the same name as the bishop there, and it is spelled in the same way.

I read another letter from Philadelphia:

As a loyal citizen, I, with thousands of others from our great State of Pennsylvania, urgently remonstrate against the persecution of Catholics in Mexico by that tyrannical Government. Will you not employ your kind offices for the purpose of persuading our Government to denounce such outrages?

Yours respectfully,

RAYMOND FARRELL.

Here is another letter from Philadelphia, addressed to the same Representative:

As a loyal citizen, I, with thousands of others of our great State of Pennsylvania, strongly protest against the persecution of Catholics in Mexico. Will you not use your kind offices—

And so forth.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS J. McNALLY.

Here is another one from Philadelphia:

As a loyal citizen, I, with thousands of others of our great State of Pennsylvania, strongly protest against the persecution of the Catholics of Mexico by that tyrannical Government—

And so forth.

The remainder is exactly the same as the other letters.

Here is a letter from William S. Murphy, of Philadelphia:

As an American citizen and Roman Catholic, I strongly protest the treatment being given the Mexican Catholics by the Mexican Government.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM S. MURPHY.

Do these letters sustain the charge that I raised the religious issue? These letters are dated last spring and were mailed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and buried in the files of that committee, and I did not know about them until right recently. The Republican House of Representatives never had those hearings printed. Think of that, Senators! A movement to plunge our country into war for the purpose of crushing a Republic that is trying to be delivered from the weight and ignorance of a Catholic hierarchy never being put in print, never issued in pamphlet form where the citizens of the United States could get hold of the hearings and read them. Is that some more of the secret and insidious work of the Catholic clergy and the Catholic hierarchy in the United States? Can they do a thing like that and get away with it in the United States? Can they stage a hearing in the Capitol—a Catholic hearing, where nobody is heard but Catholics—and then have the statements taken down and put away, hidden in the archives of the Republican committee, never printed and given to the public? The public has never seen them. I am the first Member of Congress who has ever brought them to public notice. I am doing that to-day. I am reading from them now, because, thank God, I had a right to demand to see them. They are a part of the records of Congress, and the public is entitled to know the truth concerning them; and yet I have been assailed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who imagines he is running for President. [Laughter.] He was being considered a little until he came in here one day and became the senatorial mouthpiece of the Catholic clergy; but when he took up their campaign and tried to lecture an American Senator because he told the truth about the Knights of Columbus and because he exposed the effort of the Knights of Columbus to involve us in war with Mexico the Senator from Missouri quickly turned the toes of his presidential boom to the daisies. [Laughter.]

As I said on a former occasion, I was in Washington when the Knights of Columbus passed that Mexican war resolution in Philadelphia, and when I read it in the Washington Post I gave out a statement against it, urging the President not to be misled by it nor to permit anybody to get us into war. And one day, when the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was speaking in behalf of peace, I recalled that resolution, and I sent over to the Library and got it and I read it to the Senate—not what I had written but what the Knights of Columbus had written—and it went out in my speeches to the people of the Nation; and I have received over 3,000 letters, 1,500 of which I have not yet read, indorsing what I had done, commenting upon the expressions used in the resolution and scores of them

denouncing the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE].

And when I read and discussed that resolution the Roman Catholic press viciously attacked me. One of these little squirrel-headed fellows up there in the Senate press gallery, who is either a Catholic himself, or has married a Catholic, or his father or mother is a Catholic—and you had better be on the lookout and beware of them whenever they are tied up, so I have been told, because they are the fellows "they" sometimes get to join the Masons and other fraternal orders so as to keep the Catholic clergy informed on vital matters with regard to American Protestants and Jews. If you find one of them that is tied up by blood or marriage with the Catholics, it is strange, but somehow or other it seems they dominate him. There is a deep and strange tie that binds. They have a secret hold on him, somehow, that enables them to use him in an emergency. They have some mysterious order, I have heard, into which they initiate one of that type. Why, I have even known a peculiar kind of Mason to quit the Masonic fraternity and become a Catholic and a Knights of Columbus, and I have heard that there are one or two of them in this Chamber. That is plain talk, too. Will I be again accused of being a religious bigot for telling the truth?

Here is a letter from Mrs. Mary R. Conroy about this war promoting resolution:

I wish to enter a strong protest against the barbarous treatment of Catholics in Mexico.

Then she asks the man to whom she wrote to use his influence for the resolution.

The same thing in another letter from Pennsylvania.

I protest against the persecution of the Catholics of Mexico by that tyrannical government.

Are they asking here to prevent the Mexican Government from trampling on American rights and liberties? Are they asking for a nation-wide movement, joined in by Gentiles and Jews alike? Oh, no; it is a Catholic movement pure and simple. It was started by them, carried on by them, the resolution was introduced by one of them, the indorsements of the resolution came from nobody else, and I think that they kept the hearings from being printed.

God save our country if any religious sect can slip into this Capitol and pull off a private hearing, in favor of war, with a room filled only with their members and the statements made kept secret from the public! That is what appears to have been done by the Catholic Clergy. I am going to read about what occurred in that room in a minute. If they can pull that sort of thing off, and so influence a Republican Congress as to keep it from printing it, it looks suspicious and dangerous to me. I wonder if the Republicans are flirting and dickering with the Catholic hierarchy? If you are, as a Democrat, after the fashion of Jefferson and Jackson, I wish to say that you are entirely welcome to all the recruits that you are now bidding for. I wish here to declare that the Democratic Party shall not be used as a tail to a Roman Catholic kite—if I can prevent it.

Here is another letter supporting the Boylan resolution:

As a loyal citizen of your congressional district, I urgently ask you to use your kind influence in a protest to the American Government against the barbarous treatment accorded the Catholics of Mexico.

Yours respectfully,

J. THOMAS HAUGHEY.

Here is another from Philadelphia to Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania:

I, as a loyal citizen of the United States, ask you, by virtue of your office, to consider the persecution of "our Catholic fellow citizens" in Mexico unfriendly.

Very respectfully yours,

MARIA SCHUMACHER.

Now a word about the hearing involving a religious issue that a handful of Senators have said was injected by "the Senator from Alabama." That is what the white-haired old Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] said. Why, it is said that he has been a terror for a long time politically. I do not know about that, but I do know that he made a great mistake when he came into this Chamber and criticized me for bringing to the attention of the Senate the organized effort of the Knights of Columbus to involve our country in war with Mexico. Loyal American citizens everywhere resent that. His speech here the other day was the speech that he has made—part of it—frequently about the World War, how Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, fought side by side. Senators have heard him make parts of it here before. He made it a night or two later in New York; and "Marcus Aurelius Sullivan"—poor Mark!—

whenever they throw enough coin in Mark's direction favorable results will follow. Mark loves the chink of the coin. He wrote a letter to the papers praising REED and the "masterful speech" that he made, and how impromptu and yet masterful it was. I had read part of it several times myself; and a part of it was made in New York the other night, as I said a moment ago. Mark writes a good deal, and Mark knows how to write. He is a good writer, and he knows who to write for, because "the ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib." [Laughter.]

He also said the Senator from Missouri had nothing to fear about the situation; that it was not the Senator's business to look after the Catholic side of the matter.

Well, Mr. President, many Senators and a lot of people think that he was doing that precise thing, and I am one of them, because I know the Senator's record. He has always opposed our immigration measures, and the Catholic hierarchy has fought them from the beginning. The Catholic clergy is opposed to restricted immigration. Roosevelt once said, according to Archie Butt's letters—and he, Archie Butt, was a Roman Catholic—that "the Catholic Church was out of place in the United States; that it could not hope to grow; it was out of sympathy and harmony with our free institutions; the only way it could hope to grow was through immigration." So the Senator from Missouri, when he opposed, as he always has, restricted immigration, was doing precisely what the Catholic hierarchy wanted him to do.

So Mr. Mark Sullivan—dear and magnificent Mark [laughter], with his pen-pushing proclivities—is magnifying the effort and praising the Senator from Missouri for what he calls a great speech made in the Senate in reply to me. Well, now, just between us, other Senators agree with me that it was not a great speech. And they agree with me that it in no sense replied to my speech. One thing about it is certain, it pleased all the Catholic priests in the country. They clapped their hands for joy and poured out copious Catholic eulogies upon his old white head [laughter], and they are almost persuaded to tell him that he can have the Catholic vote for President.

Sensors, have you ever seen one of these old swamp rabbits run in the canebrake? Well, they cut their own path through the canebrake, and it is just big enough for them to travel in, and a dog has difficulty, in chasing them, to get through the canebrake in the path they have cut. Every now and then a sharp piece of cane will prick him and you will hear him holler, and the rabbit keeps just far enough ahead to stay out of his way. He thinks he is smart. He travels the path he has cut for himself.

When the cane pricks the dog he hears the dog howl and he knows just how fast to move to keep in front of him. But we boys that knew how to hunt those swamp canebrake rabbits would find where he came out in the open on the edge of the swamp; he would run up a little piece, 30 or 40 yards, and then get in another path that he had cut out for himself and go back into the canebrake. He would come out to get a breath of air and view the situation, to "look the landscape o'er"; and we would go to where his path came out to the edge, and one on one side and one on the other, when he came out we shooed him out into the open field, and the dogs would catch him before he ever got back to the swamp. Now, when we get JIM out of the paths cut by himself in the Catholic canebrake, out in the open field where whole-hearted Americans can see him, we will catch him before he ever gets back. [Laughter.]

Now, I will read to you a statement about the Republican House committee hearing upon the Boylan resolution. Listen to this, Senators:

At that time we reported the hearing as packed by Roman Catholics, as being an attempt on the part of the Romanists to use the United States Government to accomplish its sectarian ends and stem the advance of liberty in Mexico.

The statements then made before the committee were false, and when we indicated—

Listen to this—

When we indicated our disbelief in the committee room, we were set upon by a number of those who were trying to have our Government commit an unfriendly act toward the people of Mexico in their struggle to escape the oppressive political and educational yoke of Roman priestcraft.

Can you visualize the situation in that room? A few Protestants had slipped in, and when they indicated that what the others were telling the committee about the Mexican situation was not true they were turned upon and stared out of countenance. A hostile attitude was displayed toward them in the committee room, where the hearing was that of Catholics and Catholics

only, and a Protestant who made a protest was looked upon with daggers in the eyes of the Catholics present. He was offending them, because he was interfering with their war program.

Listen to this, Senators; I am reading from the same article:

For over a week we have endeavored to secure a copy of this hearing which the Roman Catholics obtained before the standing Committee of the House on Foreign Affairs. The report of this hearing may as well have been in the treasure house of the Vatican.

Do you get that? Right here in the Capitol of the United States a solemn hearing had, involving a question of two nations going to war, involving the relationship of the greatest Government in all the world with that of a sister Republic struggling amidst great difficulties to get on her feet and become one of the great republics of the earth, our Government lending friendly assistance and bidding her Godspeed; a hearing held in the Capitol of the United States, the statements made never given to the public. I am giving them publicity for the first time to-day.

Here we are, right on the verge of war with Nicaragua. Anybody who knows anything knows what our activities down there mean.

Diaz, the President of Nicaragua, is a Catholic and is not in fact and not by right President at all. According to the statements of the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], a Republican, Diaz has no right to occupy the Presidency. That is the situation reaching from the Knights of Columbus to the committee room in this Capitol; and the Catholic President Diaz, of Nicaragua, and this Republic—God help us—is held in the balance in a situation like that. God give our President courage to resist the pressure being brought upon him to go to war with Mexico.

This article continues:

To our repeated efforts—

To get these hearings the writer of that article means—

the reply has been that the committee voted not to publish them, and that they could not be seen without the order of the chairman of the committee, and what his order might be we were left to judge, as he would not be in the Capital for some days. It is the usual custom to publish such hearings. We have never before been denied the right of consulting the records of a public hearing before any congressional committee, whether published or not.

Have we reached the time when we are going to depart from the old American custom? Have we reached the time when the report of a hearing of this important and serious character, brought about by a resolution introduced by a member of the Catholic Church in the House, a resolution supported only by Catholic religious societies through the Nation and Catholic priests and Catholic bishops, can be hid away locked up in a desk and nobody but Catholics know what is in the record? Are the American people, whose peace and happiness and lives would be at stake in a war, to be denied the right to know the facts in this particular grave and threatening situation?

Sensors, you are going to hear from this matter. As you live and there is a just God above us, you can not get away with that sort of thing in the Congress of the United States, in this American Republic of ours. Republicans or Democrats have no right to have a hearing like that behind closed doors, for that is what it amounts to if you do not publish it—star-chamber procedure, "speakeasy," whispered conversations on the part of one religious group engineering a war to aid a similar religious group in another country.

The Knights of Columbus in their resolution, in spite of this Government's position, pledged support of 800,000 Knights of Columbus to the Knights of Columbus in Mexico. What did that mean, and what are the Knights of Columbus over there doing? They are trying to overthrow the Government which this Government has recognized. Are the Knights of Columbus here who are doing that loyal? Are they upstanding and absolutely loyal American citizens? Can they support this Government truly, loyally, and at the same time extend encouragement to a rebellious army in Mexico, pledging them their strength and their all—800,000 men to participate in battle if necessary? That is the truth; and yet they and their friends here assail me for coming into the Senate and saying what I have said.

One of these Catholic papers said there was one encouraging sign about this thing, that I was alone in my stand in this matter, and that the other Senators seemed to be against me. That is not true. It is absolutely false. Four-fifths of the Members of this body are with me in the fight I am making.

Three-fourths of the Members of this body are ready to say now that I have committed no offense against my country and violated no propriety when I dared to tell the Senate and the

country about the Mexican war activities of the Knights of Columbus of the United States. If you believe they do not agree to it, let your Catholic press agents here go and ask them, because the day is not far distant when Senators are going to be asked on the stump in their respective States whether they indorse my stand or not. If we must have a war of spoken and written words on this great question, let us have it to the end that the whole truth may be known. There is no letting up on a matter where truth and light and life and death are at stake. The call of duty, the love of country, and the interests of humanity impel you to carry on if you are a real American.

Mr. President, I want to read another line or two from this article on the hearings before the House committee. Speaking about the failure to get a copy of these hearings, this article goes on to say:

This is a strange procedure and most uncommon in a democracy.

And I ask you Senators, is it not? I ask Democrats and Republicans alike, is it not a strange procedure? I am a Protestant. I am a member of the Methodist Church. I have two brothers who are Methodist preachers. I would not any more permit the Methodist Church to carry on as the Catholics have carried on in this thing and remain silent than I would jump off the Washington Monument. No church society, no religious organization, no religious sect has the right to slip up to this Capitol and inaugurate a movement which would start the tread of armies, the shedding of blood, the giving up of human life to further the religious cause of any group of people in these United States. We are not going to do it. This Government will not go to war for the Catholic Church, and it will not go to war for any other church now in existence or hereafter to come into existence.

Any question about which we go to war must be an American question. It must affect genuine American rights, and bona fide interests, and real American liberty.

Mr. President, I never dreamed, until this Catholic-Mexican war controversy came up, about the pernicious and insidious activities of the Pope of Rome in America. I never knew what power he had politically over the Catholic hierarchy and clergy in the United States. I have been receiving letters from every nook and corner of our country, from Democrats and Republicans alike. They have given me information, they have sent me pamphlets and books to read that have opened my eyes. They have sent me periodicals from Catholics carrying bitter attacks upon me. I never dreamed, I repeat, until this controversy arose, that they were doing the things that I have found them doing in the United States.

When I dared to come in here and speak, as I have a right to speak, about the Knights of Columbus, the head of that order came out and practically denied that what I had said here was in the Knights of Columbus resolution, and I read the resolution to the Senate again. He issued a statement in which he said the Catholic Church was not involved, that it was not that at all. I have shown by Catholic priests, Catholic judges, Catholic nuns, Catholic societies, that it is the Catholic Church, and nothing but the Catholic Church behind this particular phase of the program to involve us in war with Mexico.

Are Senators going to be fair-minded enough to pass judgment on the question as to who is responsible for raising this Catholic religious issue—myself, or those who are under some kind of obligations to the Pope of Rome? Listen to this:

If the statements upon which the Romanists would have the United States break with Mexico were sustainable, they certainly would not hesitate to have the hearings published.

Is not that sound and reasonable, Senators? A jury assembled and a case being tried, and the testimony locked up in a desk; somebody making speeches before the jury and passing literature around to induce them to think a certain way, to convince them, in order to make them reach a certain verdict, and somebody coming up and saying, "Why don't you give them the evidence? Why don't you let them know who is back of this? Why not tell them the truth?"

They say, "No; that is locked up. We are not going to let you see the evidence. It has not been printed." Yet the American people, the great jury involved, the great jury most interested, the great jury from whose ranks the boys must come at the beat of the drum and the flying of the flag, who must go into bloody murderous war, if it comes, are not permitted to know what the facts are. The facts are kept pigeonholed and hidden away, and in the meantime the Knights of Columbus flood the country with their pamphlet, "Red Mexico." Read it, get excited, write to Congress to move to break off diplomatic relations with Mexico. Where is the evidence? Why is it locked up? Why will you not let us read it? "We just decided somehow, or somehow else, in this particular Catholic pro-

cedure, that the hearings would not be published." God forbid that another such occurrence will ever be recorded again in the history of our country.

I am still reading from the article published by the Western Christian Advocate:

Not being able to get access to the verbatim report of the hearings, we found a prominent member of the committee and asked him why they were suppressed. He replied that the committee agreed that because of the evident inaccuracies—

Listen to this, Senators—

and misrepresentations in the testimony of the witnesses, who were excited and sensational, it was better that the hearings be withheld from the public.

God of the Republic, what are we coming to? They are not the judges. They ought to publish the hearings, let the country have them, let the newspapers give the facts, if they will, to the people whose Government this is. Why not publish them? They said the members of the committee decided that the witnesses made misrepresentations to them; in other words, what they were stating as to why the Boylan resolution should be passed was not true but false. Yet at the bottom of it and back of it was a movement to sever diplomatic relations and go to war with Mexico. Senators, all that has transpired behind closed doors and the testimony has never to this day been published.

A paper called the Springfield (Mo.) News, a Catholic sheet, has paid its caustic respects to me. They had an editorial the title of which was, "HEFLIN a bigoted ass," and from that they got more intemperate and slanderous. It is the vilest language, most intemperate and insulting, which causes me to remark again, What is there about this whole Catholic situation in the United States that makes them so sensitive when an American Senator, who has no allegiance but his allegiance to his country, discusses matters that affect the peace and happiness of the United States is compelled in the discharge of his duty to mention the strange and conspicuous doings of the certain Roman Catholics of the United States?

Is a Senator guilty of an un-American act when he tells the Senate about the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to get our country into war?

I do not think so.

This Catholic editor of the Catholic News, of Springfield, Mo., then said, speaking about me:

His charge that the Knights of Columbus, a church brotherhood, wantonly seeks to provoke war with Mexico could be dismissed as absurd were it not so treasonable.

Treasonable to what? Mr. President, this editor discloses the fact in that statement that he is a subject of the Pope of Rome, and he got me mixed up with himself. He owes allegiance to the Pope of Rome, and yet he is making his living out of the people of the United States. He is writing for a paper in the United States, and, when digging me, he forgets himself, thinking of the Pope, and says that I have committed a crime that is treasonable. Treasonable to what and to whom? Not to my country. I am for my country above everything else. Can the Roman Catholic hierarchy say that? I do not think it can.

Again, he said, speaking of me:

He offers no proof of the accusations which he makes, and no sensible man will believe he has any to offer.

I have read to-day for an hour and a half the testimony from Catholic sources about a Catholic resolution offered in the House and a Catholic resolution of the Knights of Columbus, and Catholic activities—and nothing but Catholic activities—because there is nobody else in the movement. It is a Catholic program from start to finish; and here is this man saying that I have no proof. He is attempting to mislead and deceive the people who read his paper.

The facts speak for themselves. The resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus in Philadelphia has been read recently by millions of American people. Its meaning is plain to every loyal American. The resolution speaks for itself. Let us inquire, first, Did the Knights of Columbus of the United States pass that resolution? Answer, yes. Did that resolution condemn the United States Government's policy toward Mexico and at the same time encourage the Knights of Columbus in Mexico to continue their activities against the Government which the United States had recognized? Answer, yes. Did the Knights of Columbus pledge a million dollars at Philadelphia to be used in opposition to the position taken by and in opposition to the officially declared policy of the United States Government toward Mexico? Answer, yes. Did the Knights of Columbus, with full knowledge of the expressed desire of the United

States Government to sanction in every way possible the ties of peace, friendship, and good will existing between the two Governments, urge in that resolution the Knights of Columbus of Mexico to continue their opposition to the Mexican Government and pledge them the aid of 800,000 Knights of Columbus in the United States? Answer, yes. That is enough testimony. There are the facts. They can not be denied.

Here is a resolution from the Knights of Columbus later than the one in August, 1926:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
New Haven, Conn., November 1, 1926.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER—

This is from James A. Flaherty, the supreme head of the Knights of Columbus—

At regular quarterly meeting of the supreme board of directors, held on October 9-10, 1926, the following action was taken:

"Voted, that a special assessment of \$1.50 be levied on each member of the order as of November 1, 1926, for the purpose of creating a fund to be used in carrying on education, welfare, and relief work in connection with the Mexican situation."

The action taken by the board, as above, is in accordance with resolutions unanimously adopted by the supreme council on August 5, 1926.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES A. FLAHERTY.

[NOTE.—Under section 168 of the laws and rules of the order members have 30 days from November 1, 1926, within which to pay the special per capita assessment for the Mexican fund.]

That is another document from the headquarters of the Knights of Columbus. Notation at the bottom:

Return this card with \$1.50 at once to your financial secretary to avoid suspension.

Oh, they mean business. They are hot on the trail of war. They do not intend to let up until their purpose is accomplished. They say, "You must pay this by a certain time into the Mexican fund in order to avoid suspension."

Mr. President, there never before was such a secretive war movement started and carried on in secret so long without the Jews and the Protestants of America knowing what was going on in their midst. Senators who are so exceedingly fond of the Catholic clergy, like the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Bruce] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Reed], eulogize and bill and coo so softly and sweetly when they are trying to please the Catholic clergy. But they turn loose a tirade against an American Senator who dares to stand in his place and speak for his country against the un-American activities of the Catholic clergy. I am going to give my opinion, because I believe in speaking out in meeting. I think some one requested both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri to say something in answer to my speech. They know whether that is true or not. I think somebody suggested to them that they ought to get after me and see if they could not stop me. Well, they did not know me. I never started a fight in my life until I was sure that I was right. Right is right as God is God. When I start into a thing and believe I am right, why should I quit because somebody whose political strength and affiliations that I know about and understand dares to stand up here in disguise and speak for the Pope? I should hate for anybody who bears my name ever to think that I had laid my hand to the plow in a righteous cause and quit because I was politically afraid or because my life had been threatened.

I have a letter in my pocket now, an anonymous letter mailed in Boston, from one of those fellows who tells me that he is coming to Washington with 10 others, and that if I do not let up on the Knights of Columbus they would pick me off, and that he won a prize for marksmanship in the marines. A man has but one time to die. Mr. President, I love life, I love humanity, and I love my country. I love the people who have honored me with a seat in the Senate. They have been good to me.

They sent me to this body by a vote of 55 counties out of 67 when there were five candidates in the race, an ex-governor, an ex-Senator, an ex-Member of Congress and a distinguished lawyer at the capital of my State.

I want to tell Senators something of the history of that campaign. Prior to that the Legislature of Alabama had before it a bill seeking to put all educational institutions under the same authority and to permit an inspection of those institutions by State authority. But the Catholic clergy rose up in their wrath and protested. They said "You may inspect the other schools, but you must not inspect the Catholic convents." One of the men who ran against me appeared before a committee

of the legislature with some of the sisters opposing that legislation. I learned about that. He had attacked me in the campaign. I replied that I differed from him on a great many questions and that was one of them. I said, "What right has the Pope of Rome or the Catholic clergy in the United States to set up an institution of learning in my State and put it beyond the jurisdiction of the lawful authorities of Alabama, to admit that we may require inspection of Presbyterian schools, Methodist schools, Baptist schools, Jewish schools, Protestant schools, but that we can not inspect the Catholic schools, claiming that they are out of our jurisdiction, that their control belongs to the Pope of Rome." I said, "I do not stand for that doctrine. I am in favor of putting them all on a common level; inspect Catholic, Protestant, Jewish institutions alike. That is the distilled essence of democracy." I have no apology to make for my stand then and I have no apology to make for the stand I am taking here now. I was right then; I am right now.

Do Senators know what happened to me? Every Catholic in my State voted against me because of that. They flashed word over the State, almost in the twinkling of an eye, to vote against HEFLIN and I heard of one Catholic priest, whom I had never seen, denouncing me. The Catholics marshaled their vote against me because I dared to take an American stand. This is not the first time I have been opposed by the Roman Catholic clergy, but this time it is on a much larger scale. I confess to you that I never dreamed of the nation-wide activities of the Roman Catholic clergy as I have found it to exist to-day. I never dreamed that there was so much intolerance, intemperance, and religious bigotry amongst one group of people as I have found in the Roman Catholic clergy and the Roman Catholic press. They seem to care nothing about the facts and the decent proprieties of the matter.

Think of a Roman Catholic priest claiming to represent Jesus Christ indulging in the intemperate and insulting language that some of them have used against me. The spirit that they have displayed in this matter is more of the spirit of Satan.

It is time somebody was taking the mask off them, and I am in the humor to do it.

Why, Mr. President, there are other religious denominations in the United States. Since the Catholics have raised this question, I do not believe that I would be doing wrong to read a statement from some Protestant Christians. They are interested; their boys would have to fight if we have war.

I am going to read this, even if I offend some of the Roman Catholic clergy who are sitting in the galleries, and some of their agents who have been here for a week or more to report what I do and say against their miserable attempt to plunge us into war. Let me read this:

LINDSEY, OHIO, February 13, 1927.

The letter is addressed to me—

DEAR SENATOR: A resolution has been passed in our Bible school, which has a membership of 300, sanctioning your attitude and stand you are taking in regard to the Mexican situation.

I have been asked to mail a copy of this resolution assuring you of our prayers and support.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. MAGSIG,
Superintendent Christian Citizenship
Evangelical Bible School.

Here is a resolution from Kalamazoo, Mich.:

Whereas the United States of America has been facing a grave crisis in the matter of being drawn into war with Mexico; and

Whereas we believe that there is no doubt whatever that the crisis has been brought about by propaganda spread by the Roman hierarchy and the Knights of Columbus to precipitate such a war, for the sole purpose of establishing the rule of the Roman Catholic Church over the country of Mexico—

Is there anything in that resolution in conflict with the evidence I have presented?

Whereas this country as a Nation can have no interest in the internal affairs of Mexico; and

Whereas a United States Senator, one J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, has had the wisdom and courage to understand the situation and denounce the scheme on the floor of the Senate: Therefore let it be

Resolved, That this organization, composed of several hundred women, hereby express our gratitude and appreciation to Senator HEFLIN for his public stand on this matter and for the masterly and inspiring address made by him and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and let it be further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be placed upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy be mailed to Senator HEFLIN.

And so forth.

Betsy Ross Club.

Is not that a good old American name? It was Betsy Ross who cut the pattern of the flag. George Washington seeking a banner to be borne in battle, wanting a design for a flag, some suggested a beast of prey—a lion, a bear, or some other ferocious animal—but none of these represented the lofty purpose and ideals of those who were staking their all for liberty; and a small voice told Washington to look up. He lifted his eyes toward the sky, the land of the stars. God gave him a vision of heavenly blue with stars peeping through; of rainbow bars—golden stars. Washington sketched the vision and Betsy Ross made the Stars and Stripes. Flag of our country, flag of our Union, representing liberty, freedom of speech, freedom of press, free American institutions, all.

There is not room enough here for the Roman Catholic clergy and the Roman Catholic hierarchy if they hold allegiance to the Pope of Rome. That flag must never be used as a banner in battle to further the cause of the Roman Catholic Church.

Senators, you are going to hear from this issue in America. A secret, behind-closed-door proceeding hatching out a war in a Republican committee room and none of the proceedings published, everything kept hidden; the Knights of Columbus flooding the country with their pamphlets and just ready to sound the call to arms when we stopped them by our righteous protest in the open Senate! Senators, you know that is true. I am getting thousands of letters from all over the Nation saying that the fight we made here stopped this war. So, Mr. President, you can understand how and why they hate me. It is because I have led the fight; because I knew of that Knights of Columbus resolution, and I am the man who brought it to this floor. Therefore they have leveled their guns on me; they have written untruthful stories about me; they have attacked and slandered me from one end of this country to the other. Why? Because I interfered with the war program of the Pope, because I exposed the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to involve my country in war. Is there any getting away from that fact? There is not.

What else, Mr. President? The intemperate and vicious attacks made upon me by the Roman Catholic press and Roman Catholic priests for exposing the miserable Mexican-war scheme of the Knights of Columbus have convinced me of two things—first, that they are the most narrow-minded, intolerant, bigoted people in the United States, and that they place their allegiance to the Roman Catholic hierarchy above their allegiance to the United States. Instead of discussing my position in a calm and dispassionate way and undertaking to answer my arguments with facts, they assail me in the most undignified, vicious, and insulting language they can employ. They seem also to be trying to teforize other American Senators by showing them how dangerous it is for any Senator to incur the displeasure of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. That is surely the purpose of it, Mr. President.

I repeat, from one end of the country to the other they have attacked me most viciously; they have mailed their venomous attacks to other Senators for the purpose of letting them know that if anyone of them ever dares to speak in the American Senate against the program and purposes of the Pope the Roman Catholic press and priests will vilify and slander them just as they have vilified and slandered me. Their attitude in this matter shows that they are in no sense governed by the spirit of justice and fair play; that the welfare of this country is not the thing uppermost in their minds; that they would, if they had the power, deny to me or to any other American Senator the right to stand here and discuss and expose the efforts of certain Roman Catholics to involve the United States in war. They have misrepresented and slandered me in the Catholic press and in near-Catholic papers which they control, and here in the twentieth century, in free America, a Roman Catholic priest in the Senate gallery hissed me while I was speaking in the Senate of the United States. Couple that, if you please, with the star-chamber proceeding in the House committee, the hearings of which were never printed, with the threats to take my life that have emanated from Roman Catholics. Think of a Catholic priest hissing a United States Senator in the American Senate—all this under Republican rule—for daring to tell the truth about the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and another Roman Catholic priest, a villainous little counterfeit of a man up in New York by the name of Belford, suggesting that they hire a thug and attack me and "beat me up," to use his language!

Senators, I want you to get in your minds the intemperate, intolerant, and vicious spirit that is in those people. I want

you to get their viewpoint for a minute—how hateful, how miserably mean and venomous they are toward a man who will dare to speak out against their purposes in the United States. That is all they have against me. If I were as friendly and useful to them as the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri they would praise me, just as they praise them. Since this controversy has arisen I have denounced their un-American conduct. I have dared to oppose their fixed purpose to plunge my country into war. I have shown the Senate, as I am showing the country, that this was a Roman Catholic move from the outset.

I inquire again who was it that was sending these telegrams to the committee that are incorporated in the stenographic report of the hearing? Roman Catholics; Catholic societies and Catholic priests. Who introduced the war resolution in the House? A Roman Catholic Member of Congress. Who passed the war-promoting resolution at Philadelphia? Roman Catholics; Knights of Columbus. Who was it that pronounced his blessing upon the good effect it was having amongst Protestants? Bishop Daugherty, a Roman Catholic. There you are; and yet they try to deceive the public into believing that I have misrepresented the facts. I read:

It is highly encouraging to note that the Federated Council of Churches in the United States (Protestant) has gone on record against applying undue pressure on Mexico; and that the American Federation of Labor, through its president, William Green, has expressed the wish that the United States "will not play the part of an imperialistic autocrat in its relations with Latin-American countries, but will prove itself to be, by practice and precept, an advocate and proponent of self-government and democratic freedom," and that all over our land many of our best and finest men and women have already protested against the coercion of Mexico.

Am I doing anything wrong in reading that? Following all those messages about the Roman Catholic religion in Mexico, should I not bring to the knowledge of the Senate and the country the fact that the Protestant people and the Jewish people of this Nation are against this insidious movement to involve us in war with Mexico?

Here is a little sheet I want to read to you. I want the boys in the press gallery to hear this, especially those who are still free to act as real Americans, who have no foreign attachments, who are at liberty to write as American citizens writing to an American paper, giving the truth to American people about an American question. I am now talking particularly to them.

You know I read a letter here from a gentleman in Baltimore, in which he said that his old friend who had been a newspaper man had read a number of Roman Catholic newspapers and said, "They have passed the word to the chain of Roman Catholic papers to go after HEFLIN," and what do you reckon these Roman Catholic press fellows did? Why, they came back and said there was no such thing. Now, I will give you the proof showing that there is a Roman Catholic press in the United States. Listen to this:

Newspaper men generally are not aware that any chain of Catholic newspapers exist.

Well, now, let us see about that.

[From the Catholic Press]

ARMED RESISTANCE BY MEXICAN CATHOLICS DECLARED LEGITIMATE

ROME, January 24.—Mexican prelates now in Rome have consulted with professors of theology of the Society of Jesus at the Gregorian University and of the Dominican Order at Angelico College about armed opposition to the Government in Mexico as it affects Catholics.

They have gone to Rome to consult the Pope of Rome, way off in another country, far from Mexico; they have gone to see him to ask him about armed resistance in a country and against a Government that this Government has recognized and is trying to help get on its feet.

Listen:

These professors unanimously declared such opposition to be legitimate, and even dutiful defense, because there is in question an order of extermination issued by President Calles against the Catholic religion, for which there is no other remedy than armed defense.

That is from the same paper. Now, what about the Catholic press?

It can be safely asserted that the Catholic press alone presents to the public the full and accurate story of those happenings which, in various nations, affect profoundly the interests of the Catholic Church and the welfare of her members. A pertinent illustration of the specific service which the Catholic press has rendered in this respect is seen in the present Mexican situation.

How is that, Senators?

Practically the only agency to place before the American people the facts about Mexico has been the Catholic press.

Where are those newspapers who said that they did not have a Roman Catholic press in the United States? And this article is from a Roman Catholic, in the Catholic press.

He continues:

A just appreciation of the work of the Catholic press is now possible through the statements of the Secretary of State of the United States before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Who, after reading the momentous declarations of Secretary Kellogg, can doubt that the radical forces in Mexico, now warring against the church, are one in sentiment and purpose with those in other countries whose objective has been the destruction of all religion?

It is a Roman Catholic religious question; and now he is hinting that they have even got the ear of Secretary Kellogg, that even he is being influenced by the Catholic press.

Listen to this, Senators:

Nevertheless, until the Secretary made his statement, the average reader of our secular newspapers had little or no notion of the radically anti-Christian policy being pursued in Mexico by the present rulers.

Not only has the Catholic press kept the Catholics of America informed about Mexico and other countries where the church is suffering, but it has a part in other praiseworthy movements.

Here is another squib from the same sheet:

In February the Catholic press with the indorsement of the Holy See calls to you for support and cooperation.

This is from the Morning Star, official journal of the archdiocese of New Orleans and the diocese of Savannah, New Orleans, La., February 5, 1927.

Do you need any more proof to show that there is a Roman Catholic press, and that Roman Catholic press is now hot on my trail? But, Mr. President, every attack they make upon me is testimony to the loyalty of my service to my flag and my country. Every attack they make upon me is proof that I am interfering with their insidious, un-American movements. Every villainous attack they make against me is proof of my undivided loyalty to the Government of the United States, and that is more than they can say.

What else?

Here is the Universe Bulletin, Roman Catholic, July 21. This is published in Cleveland, Ohio.

Random remarks by L. G. W.

He says:

These are exciting days in the United States Senate, from the fear of intervention first in Nicaragua and then in Mexico. * * * Senator HEPLIN, in charging that the Catholics of our country wanted war against Mexico, relying for his proofs upon the strongest paragraphs in the Knights of Columbus resolution and anonymous letters, was left unaided to fight his battles. Six Senators of his own party assailed him and his statements, three Catholics and three non-Catholics.

I invite you, Senators, to watch the political course of all these Senators in the future. The loyal, upstanding, intelligent American people will not tolerate any trifling or uncouth dealing with this Roman Catholic hierarchy that I have exposed in this body. Just remember my statement about that.

There is no denying—

Now, get this language, Senators, from this same Universe Bulletin, Roman Catholic—

There is no denying the fact that the resolutions and attitude of the Knights of Columbus convention looked threatening, and explanation and denial has been the order of the day ever since.

Yet the head of the Knights of Columbus, Mr. Flaherty, stated, over his signature, in a press dispatch that went throughout the country, that no such purpose was in that Knights of Columbus resolution, and no suggestion of intervention; and here is one of his own flock saying that it was threatening, and that they have been put on the defensive ever since.

Let the laity take a lesson from the hierarchy. Take more time preparing resolutions and you will need less time for later explanations.

Do you get that, Senators?

To have erred is no disgrace. To insist that there was not the slightest error in the Knights of Columbus resolution is to claim infallibility.

Now listen—the same writer:

How different are these advanced sociological views, consistent with Leo XIII's encyclicals, with the views expressed by other coreligionists who scramble to be in the very forefront of the red scare.

Listen to this:

One would think they could wait until evidence is available, or perhaps they refuse to be happy unless there is a red menace to play with? We have in mind the renewed firebrand waved by Congressman GALLIVAN. * * *

Here is another interesting statement, in view of the fact that we have exposed the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to involve us in war with Mexico:

COLUMBUS, GA., Wednesday, January 19, 1927.—The Knights of Columbus campaign against radicalism is in full swing. Mr. Collins is one of many noted writers and lecturers now on the platform in the campaign. Three million booklets setting forth facts about Mexico have been printed and are now being distributed in North and South America. Three million more booklets are in preparation. The Knights of Columbus pledged themselves at their supreme convention in Philadelphia to pursue this campaign against sovietism in America.

The campaign they are making is against Mexico and the policies of the President of the Mexican Republic.

Here is one from the Duluth News-Tribune:

We don't owe them [the Roman Catholics] a war.

Here is the note the gentleman who mailed me that wrote. Listen to this:

Could it be possible, that on account of Mr. Doheny, who is a Roman Catholic, who has refused to comply with the Mexican oil laws, thereby aiding his (Roman Catholic) church in getting the United States involved in the issue which the Knights of Columbus are pushing?

To a man up the tree it looks very much so, since he holds 46 per cent of the unsettled or noncompliance oil interests with the Mexican Laws.

Mr. President, there is no escape from the fact that the Roman Catholic question is one of the big questions in this Mexican controversy. Here is a statement from the New York Times, mailed to me by a friend, telling why a Catholic priest quit the Knights of Columbus, and which one do you suppose he is? He is the poor, miserable, intellectually impoverished priest who wrote the letter suggesting that a thug should be hired to attack me. He is Priest Belford, and here is what he says:

I withdrew from the Knights of Columbus many years ago because of this obnoxious practice. This situation was one which seemed to leave no other course open. I knew for a certainty that a prominent officer of the organization was using his position to advance himself politically and demanded that he be brought to trial.

The trial was ordered. I had two witnesses, but this man was so strongly intrenched that he induced the employers of both these witnesses to threaten to discharge them if they testified. Thereupon I tendered my resignation.

That gives you an idea of the tremendous power of that organization. There is a Roman Catholic priest who said and was ready to prove that he had caught them red-handed in wrongdoing, this secret fraternal Christian order of the Roman Catholics, and when he forced them to trial the Roman Catholic hierarchy got busy. The word was passed around, Catholic influence was brought to bear, and the two witnesses who were ready to swear and tell the truth were threatened and frightened by those who employed them and paid them their wages. They made them back off and decline to stand up and tell the truth, and this miserable specimen of humanity, a Roman Catholic priest, gives that as his reason for quitting the order. If one of his type can not stand for the Knights of Columbus conduct, what about those of the more decent type? I read again about the Knights of Columbus in Philadelphia:

[From the Chicago Tribune, 1926]

POPE CONFERS ON CRISIS IN MEXICAN CHURCH—DISAPPOINTMENT OVER UNITED STATES RETICENCE

(By John Clayton, Chicago Tribune Press Service)

The Mexican Catholics are greatly disappointed by their failure to receive assistance from the United States.

Senators, do you get the significance of that language? Let me read it again:

The Mexican Catholics are greatly disappointed by their failure to receive assistance from the United States. They feel that Washington is supporting the Calles government in its fight against the church.

That shows that they were expecting favorable results from the activities of the Knights of Columbus in the United States. I am disclosing some astounding facts to you Senators, and they will be more astounding to the intelligent, patriotic citizens of the country, many of whom have not the slightest conception of what we are up against here in the Nation's Capital in keeping this country out of war. Anybody who has any intelligence knows that the trap is being set, the stage is being

fixed, the fireworks are almost ready to be set off in Nicaragua. War with Mexico by way of Nicaragua. Let the President beware! Let the American people write to him and write to their Members of Congress urging them to be on guard against the insidious effort to plunge our country into war. Listen to this:

Rome awaits new pronouncement from the Vatican on Mexican affairs.

Well, it is none of our business in the United States, is it, what they do amongst themselves over there regarding the Roman Catholic Church?

Mr. President, one of the witnesses before that Roman Catholic hearing in the House, a mother superior, I believe they called her, testified that Mr. Sheffield, the ambassador from our country to Mexico, seemed to be in sympathy with her and what she was saying, but his hands seemed to be tied, and that she could say more than he was willing to say; but that when she left he told her to go back to the United States and tell what she knew, and to speak long and loud.

Now, I want to ask the question which I asked here once before. Is Mr. Sheffield in sympathy with this Roman Catholic movement to involve our country in war with Mexico? I am going to cite you to two instances which seem to show that he is to some extent. Just before that Knights of Columbus convention met at Philadelphia, August 5, 1926, when Roman Catholic newspaper correspondents from this country were over in Mexico to write articles for American papers to get the American mind ready for the movement launched by the Knights of Columbus in Philadelphia, what happened? An article appearing in the Chicago Tribune, telling about what was going on over there, about what the notes contain that have passed from our Government to the Mexican Government, showing a familiarity with them, things that nobody had a right to know except those on the inside of this Government. That article appeared on the 8th of August, just after this resolution of the Knights of Columbus was passed on the 5th, and following these disclosures, whooping up war with Mexico, denouncing the Mexican Government, seeking to inflame the American mind. And then in a few days, on the 13th of August, Mr. Sheffield left Mexico for Washington, just after the resolution was passed at Philadelphia, and just after these suggestions of inside information came out from Mexico on the 8th of August, 1926. All of these things happened within the same week. Is not that a little strange?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Do I understand the Senator from Alabama states that the American ambassador to Mexico, Mr. James R. Sheffield, has been a part of a plan to encourage propaganda in this country?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know; I am just submitting the facts as I find them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator just said that he was a part of a plan, and linked his name in that utterance.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, what of it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want the Senator to be frank about it. Does he believe, or does he intend the Senate to believe, either by a direct statement or by innuendo, that the American ambassador to Mexico has been a part of this plan?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am going to be frank with the able and distinguished Senator from New York. I think that Mr. Sheffield has listened a little too much to their propaganda and that he has encouraged them somehow to feel that he was in sympathy with what they were trying to do. I am afraid that he is not as strongly opposed to war with Mexico as the American people are and would like for him to be. That is my position.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is all by inference, is it not?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is my judgment, and I am telling the Senator that I am giving the facts that I am basing that judgment upon. I am telling the Senate what occurred in the House hearings, what appeared in these newspaper articles, what the notes between the two governments contained. How did that Chicago newspaper man know unless Mr. Sheffield told him?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question, and then I do not want to yield any more. I have been speaking at great length and I want to get through.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I shall not object at all when the Senator gets through.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am satisfied the Senator will not. The Senator is in the same situation with a handful of others that I could mention.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield to me to make a statement concerning the American ambassador to Mexico?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not now. I would rather the Senator would make it in his own time—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Because I have been speaking for more than two hours already and I am anxious to get these facts into the RECORD so that the American people can know the truth. I want the whole truth to appear in the RECORD and I am willing to let the American people decide for themselves. I do say that I think that the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, became influenced somehow by this propaganda of the Knights of Columbus and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. I do not say corruptly, of course, but that somehow they got him to wobbling on the Mexican subject, I say that because right after the Knights of Columbus met at Philadelphia and passed their resolution about Mexico he gave out a statement saying there was no excuse for severing diplomatic relations, and that all that talk about religious persecution was false.

About the time I got into this debate in the Senate he seemed to have changed his position and was wobbling considerably, and his conduct was being criticized severely by the brave and able American Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and other people through the country were taking Mr. Kellogg to task. They were condemning him because he seemed to be wobbling, and the New York World, in the Senator's own State, published an editorial severely arraigning Mr. Kellogg and saying that this old man was about to blunder into war. This is a matter in which the American people are vitally interested. Mr. Sheffield is their servant.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Sheffield is not a king.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He is an honorable American gentleman—

Mr. HEFLIN. He may be. I am not saying that he is not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I happen to know; and for one, as his friend and fellow citizen in the State of New York, I resent the innuendo that he has been faithless to his trust by divulging confidential dispatches, as the Senator has sought to make the Senate and the public believe.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know whether he has disclosed them or not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator has said he does not know, but he is insinuating that he has done so.

Mr. HEFLIN. If it be an insinuation, I insinuate it again; and the Senator from New York can not by what he has said change my opinion. Sheffield's conduct speaks for itself. If what I have heard is true, he has wobbled; and I believe that he has been flirted with and that he has grown weaker on the subject. I am frank to say that his coming to Washington at the time all of this Mexican war propaganda was being turned loose in such a rush last August on America does not look good for Mr. Sheffield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He was sent for—

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. By his chief, the President.

Mr. HEFLIN. All right. Whether he was sent for or not, he came at that particular time and he came here right after all that; but it was after Mr. Kellogg had made the statement that there was no truth in the tale of religious persecution, that there was no reason to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico as the Knights of Columbus had demanded. Yet a newspaper correspondent of the Chicago Tribune told in his statement, sent all over the country by the Knights of Columbus, about many things that nobody here knew, not even Members of the United States Senate. I talked to other Senators about it. I never knew about the things stated in that war-breeding newspaper article sent out by the Knights of Columbus.

He wrote an article setting forth things, if true, that belonged only to the diplomatic agencies of the Government. The article was an inspired effort to stir up a war spirit in America toward Mexico, and we do not want any war with Mexico. It has been eight months or more since that wild story was written, and the situation is not really serious yet.

This lady who testified before the committee said that Mr. Sheffield impressed her that he wanted to say more, but he dared not, and that he told her to go to the United States and speak long and loud. What was that for? She was complaining about our policy toward the Government of Mexico. She was strong against the Government of Mexico. She was protesting against Calles and his régime, and our ambassador impressed her that he was in sympathy with her position and

told her to come back to the United States and speak long and loud. What does that mean if it does not mean encouragement to the Roman Catholic attack upon the Mexican Government already recognized by the Government of the United States?

No; the Senator from New York can not intimidate me or break the line of my argument on this subject.

The Senator from New York is situated like two or three other Senators here. The Senator from New York has already gone up against the papal machine in New York. The Senator knows perhaps that the Roman Catholic Archbishop Hayes in New York absolutely controls all of the Republican Catholics and Democratic Catholics in the State, and whatever he says goes, even against a personally very clever fellow like the Senator from New York—and he is an able and clever Senator even if he did get excited this afternoon on the Catholic situation when I mentioned his friend Sheffield. I will say this: The Senator is one of the most popular Republicans that ever came to the Senate from the State of New York. But when Al Smith was in the race for reelection for governor and the machine that I have spoken of was working, the Senator went down, and he went down before an avalanche of those ballots. They never supported him. Oh, no; he is a Protestant. They are going to do the same thing to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] when he comes up for reelection. They are going to put the touch of their dreamless slumber to his eyelids and he will fall asleep. So you can try to please them all you can, but your days are numbered.

Let me read from the Catholic Union and Times, of Buffalo, N. Y., January 22, 1927, an editorial:

It is reported that Calles is anxious to arbitrate his difficulties with the United States. That is a strange statement, if it is true. Calles was unwilling to arbitrate his difficulties with the Catholic Church in Mexico.

Is the Roman Catholic Church a government in the sense that the United States is a Government?

Who said this was not largely a Catholic religious issue from the outset? Who charged me with bringing a religious issue into this body? The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. Here is this editorial writer for the Catholics saying that the President of Mexico would not arbitrate a question with the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Mexico. The Roman Catholic situation in Mexico was the thing uppermost in his mind.

Why? Is it because Calles fears that the United States will send armed forces into Central America? Presumably so. But the State Department will have to move cautiously in arbitrating whatever differences exist with the Mexican Government.

Let me read further:

It is either a case of stalling for more time, knowing the impatience of the State Department, or it is a case where Calles hopes by mediation to elicit sympathy and support from other quarters. Arbitration will simply defer the date—

Listen to this, Senators. I am going to express another opinion for the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to think about. I am going to make the suggestion that I believe somebody has encouraged the Knights of Columbus and the Roman Catholic clergy to believe that we would intervene in Mexico some time this year or early in the spring or summer of next year. I want Senators to listen to this reading, and see whether there is reason for my statement. I have urged that we settle our differences by arbitration. This is an editorial from the Roman Catholic Union and Times of Buffalo, N. Y.:

Arbitration will simply defer the date when the United States will have to intervene in Mexican affairs.

Listen to this, Senators:

Now it is Mr. Coolidge's turn to clean Mexico of governmental banditry. He knows that it will have to be done. Every thinking man knows it. How well he does the work "cut out for him" remains to be seen.

Think of that, Senators. Ah, there is a heap of meaning in that last sentence and a political threat hid away behind it. I will read it to you again:

How well he does the work "cut out for him" remains to be seen.

Who cut out that work? How many Roman Catholics were in motion when that war-promoting resolution was put before the Republican committee of the Republican House? Two million, the priest from Washington said. How many Roman Catholic society members were indorsing that resolution? One million six hundred thousand, they claimed. How many Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus were ready to go out and give

aid to the Knights of Columbus of Mexico? Eight hundred thousand, the Knights of Columbus said. I will read that sentence again, because it is full of deep meaning:

How well he, the President, does the work "cut out for him" remains to be seen.

Listen!

Will he consent to arbitrate?

Listen!

We believe not. Unless he has in mind to will a "bad penny to a future administration."

There, couched in cunning and clever language, is a threat against President Coolidge that if he does not go to war with Mexico he will not get the vote of the Roman Catholic Church. Is the President of the United States ready to do the work "cut out for him" by the Roman Catholics, or is he going to get out of the way and permit somebody else to be elected President? That is the implied threat. There it is in plain language. Let the people think seriously and then think again. I read it again:

Unless he has in mind to will a "bad penny to a future administration." So far Mr. Coolidge has not been "a buck passer."

What does "that" mean? Does it mean that there is still hope that Mr. Coolidge will come through? Do they, because of "something," still hope that he will intervene and go to war with Mexico? Strange to say, this Roman Catholic paper still expresses the hope, after making the threat that unless he does the work "cut out for him," another administration will succeed him.

Senators, there are so many pertinent things in this case that no man can read or discuss them all in the course of any one speech, and I fear I shall have to conclude my remarks at some future time.

On August 16 Mr. Kellogg made a statement, and this was after the Knights of Columbus resolution was passed at Philadelphia on August 5. This was after the blood-curdling stories were published throughout the Nation by the Mexican correspondent inspired by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and after Mr. Sheffield came to Washington. Mr. Kellogg made this significant statement on August 16, 1926:

Paul Smiths, N. Y., August 16.

Up there in New York at the President's summer camp, where the President was hobnobbing with Al Smith, a "top-notch" Roman Catholic and Governor of the State of New York—"Cal and Al"—it will be remembered that they were up there fishing together when the President presented Al Smith with a 3-pound fish, some little "squirrel-headed" correspondent here said that I said the President had bought and bribed "Al" with a fish.

I never said anything of the kind, and that little pen pusher knew he was telling something that was not true, and yet that is what he said, which shows that they are after me. They will tell anything they can think up on me, and they have gotten the honest and patriotic American people to where they would not even believe the truth if told on me. Listen to this—it is from the Washington Post of August 17, 1926. It knocks down and tramples in the dust the Knights of Columbus resolution passed at Philadelphia:

One of the developments is said to have been a statement by Secretary Kellogg positively assuring the President that "no Americans have suffered indignities or injuries in person or property as a result of the dispossession and expulsion decrees against the clergy of Mexico and other measures for the regulation of worship carried into effect by the Calles government."

So, Mr. President, after all of this grandstand play, after the star chamber proceedings in the Republican House committee, after flooding the committee with these false reports about Mexican conditions, after the passage of the Roman Catholic war-inspiring resolution by the Knights of Columbus, and after the coming of Mr. Sheffield to the Capital, the Secretary of State issued a statement saying that there is "no truth in the talk about religious persecution."

In view of that strong statement and in view of the conduct of the Secretary of State between the 1st and 14th of January, I am justified in saying that the Secretary of State wobbled, because he seemed in his recent meanderings to be trying to pacify the Roman Catholic hierarchy of the United States. He seemed to be listening to the tales told by the Roman Catholic clergy. It seems that he was being influenced by the periodical circulated throughout the country called "Red Mexico," issued by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus. Am I not justified in drawing that conclusion? I think I am, and I have drawn it.

I read further Mr. Kellogg's statement last August:

In some cases the alleged victims were found not to suffer injury in person or property, while in others the clergymen and teachers who had suffered indignities were found to be other than American citizens.

So, according to Mr. Kellogg, there was no occasion at all for us to intervene or to marshal our Army and go across the Mexican border to engage in a long, unjustified, and bloody war.

Now, listen to this, because I want the people of America to have the whole story:

Mr. Kellogg now informs the President, in effect, that "the Knights of Columbus appeal lacks the foundation claimed for it."

Do you get that, American Senators? Listen:

It is also expected that James A. Flaherty, supreme knight of the Catholic order, will lose no time in coming here to appeal from Secretary Kellogg to the President. Mr. Flaherty originally asked for an appointment with the President here for the purpose of presenting formally the demands of the knights adopted at Philadelphia.

Do you get the force of that, Senators? Not the request of the knights, not the plan of the knights, not the petition of the knights, but the "demand" of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus. He wanted to present that demand in person at once, yet I am criticized by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] for injecting a religious question into this body, when the whole thing has been a Roman Catholic religious movement from the start. The resolutions and the telegrams and the letters I have read and the resolution of the Knights of Columbus of Maryland, all set out that it grows out of and is related to the persecution of the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico.

Again that article says:

Mr. Flaherty, head of the Knights of Columbus, was informed that his proper course would be to present the resolution of the Knights of Columbus to Secretary Kellogg and discuss the situation with him. Then, if Mr. Flaherty was not entirely satisfied with his conference with Mr. Kellogg, he was informed he could come here and the President would be glad to receive him.

So the whole farcical and infamous business went up in smoke for the time being. And the active agencies were mad and sore. These Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus did not want to stop with the Secretary of State, but they demanded an immediate audience with the President—to do what? To lay before him the "demand" of 800,000 Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in the United States. Senators, I hope it will be a long time before another such movement as this is attempted in the United States, and I want to see more courage get into the backbones of supposed-to-be American Senators here. I know, perhaps, that two-thirds of them have told me in private that they indorse my course; but the time has come to stand up and speak out. Let the American people know where we all stand. This country, I repeat, is not to be forced into war for any religious denomination.

Here is a newspaper article from little Bobby Barry. He occupies a place here in the press gallery, I think. Bobby has got some Roman Catholic attachments also, so I have been told. I do not know exactly under which one of the classes he comes, but I described them all in the outset. Now, listen to what he says. Senators probably recall—of course, you do not—how much gloom there was in Washington when I told the Senate and the country about the effort of the Knights of Columbus to get us in war with Mexico. Was there any objection on the part of Americans? Well, you will be amused by the article that I am now going to read to you.

WASHINGTON, January 19.—Dismay in Washington over Senator HEFLIN's selection of religious bigotry as inspiration of the latest of his senatorial tirades is tempered by the fact that the worst public spanking ever administered to him was at the hands of his "Democratic colleagues."

Who were "they" who responded to the call of the "Roman Catholic hierarchy"? Take their names and remember them. I mean those who bitterly criticized me. Some of the truest and best personal friends I have ever had are here on both sides of the Chamber. If Senators could read the letters—between three and five thousand—which I have received from every State in the Union indorsing the things I have said here they would see that the American people—Democrats and Republicans—are resolved that this country shall not be used as a cat's-paw by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of the United States, and that its Army shall not be used to carry out the purposes and programs of the Roman Catholic Pope. What I am talking into this RECORD to-day, what I have already said, will be an issue in every Senator's race for reelection until the people have enough men in this body to stand up and dare to tell any group

of religionists, "You can not use this country for such a purpose."

I do not fear their opposition. I welcome it. They have already started their campaign against me in Alabama. They are sending their articles to Alabama now and are having them reproduced in Roman Catholic controlled newspapers. They are belittling me; they are nagging at me; they are misrepresenting me; they are slandering me; they are vilifying me in every way that they can, but they are not hurting me. I can beat any candidate in my State, if I am living, that they can put up against me; I do not care who he is. I am not boasting when I say that; but I know in my heart that I speak the language of nine-tenths of the people of my State.

They are with me because they are red-blooded Americans; they are 100 per cent Americans; they are not intolerant toward any religion, but I want to tell Senators if what I have experienced with the Roman Catholic clergy and the Roman Catholic hierarchy is a sample of what the Roman Catholic Church is doing in the United States we have got to meet the issue.

Take Dubuque, Iowa, a community in which the Catholics have a small majority. They used to control half the board operating the public schools and the Protestants controlled the other half, but recently the Catholics took five out of the seven, turned out the Protestant teachers and put Catholic teachers in their places; and the Catholic members of the board did not even send their children to the public schools; they sent them to the parochial Catholic schools; and yet they are governing public schools to which the Roman Catholic hierarchy is deadly opposed. They hate the public-school system of the United States. We have that situation in this country. I did not know that until a patriarch from out there wrote me and gave me the facts about the situation. He said:

Senator, you have uncovered a condition that should have the attention of the American people; I have no prejudice against the individual Catholic; many Catholics are good, clever fellows; but the Catholic clergy, the Catholic hierarchy, are deadly enemies of free institutions, and they hate the public-school system of the United States. Their priests have denounced it.

I am not going to take the time to read this until to-morrow. I have statement after statement from priests and Pope denouncing the public-school system. They abhor it; they are at war with it; and, Mr. President, I have here in my files a copy of a Roman Catholic periodical published in Chicago by the bishop of the Catholic diocese there which contains the most vicious attack ever made by anybody against Freemasonry.

"Freemasonry"—the open road to damnation.

That is the way this so-called mild-mannered and tolerant group refer to organizations that they do not like in the United States. They, who claim the right from Almighty God to "direct souls to heaven," denounce Freemasonry, an institution that was established under the inspired word of God. David wanted to establish the house of the Lord, which was the birthplace of the Masonic fraternity, but God would not permit him to do so because he had been a man of war; he had shed human blood; but God promised him that his son Solomon should found the Masonic fraternity; that he should have a reign of uninterrupted peace. He had such a reign, and he set up the Masonic order, God bless it, in the temple at Jerusalem over 5,000 years ago. The tenets and principles of that immortal order have come down to us by word of mouth. You can not kill that institution; it is a humane institution, the work of the Almighty Himself, and yet the Roman Catholic bishops have denounced it. Listen at their ignorant and brutal attack:

(Copied by permission from "Life and Action," Knight Templar Conclave souvenir number, vol. 11, no. 2)

CHICAGO, ILL., August, 1910.

The following article, under the title "Freemasonry," we reproduce from the March 26, 1910, issue of the New World, the official organ of the Roman Catholic Church for the powerful diocese of Chicago:

Reasons are given for the publication, as follows:

We give it place in this special issue of Life and Action for a number of important reasons, each and all of which should be of special interest and definite value to our readers—more especially those who have any thought or consideration for the life [or death] or future welfare of the Masonic order in this country. Here are some of the reasons that impel us:

1. Because the article is false from beginning to end. It would be difficult to conceive of any article of equal length containing a larger number and volume of falsehoods, nor uttered with more destructive purpose and intent.

2. Because the article was written for and published in the official organ of the Catholic Church in Chicago, and represents the position of

that great and powerful church toward the Masonic fraternity—not at some remote period in the past when the church might plead "ignorance" as an excuse, but in the immediate present, when it should be able to speak from the fullness of its wisdom and in the spirit of truth.

Mr. President, without taking the time to read it, but I wish to read some of the infamous attacks made in this Roman Catholic publication. They say:

But the fact that an unnecessary, unlawful, and immoral oath is required—

That is what they say about the Masonic fraternity.

I am a thirty-second degree Mason, and there is not anything but sublimity from the first degree to the last. There is not anything except something that is uplifting and ennobling; there is not anything except something that contributes to patriotism and good citizenship in all those degrees. It lifts any man higher and higher in the scale of being; and yet this article denounces it and misrepresents it in the fashion which I have indicated.

* * * The fact that an oath is demanded ought to excite the suspicions of well-meaning men as to the real and ultimate purposes of the oath-bound cult.

Listen to this:

The Masonic oath is more sacred than the Bible or the church.

The Masonic oath is more sacred than religion or God.

The Masonic oath is the only absolutely necessary religion.

Now, think of that—that these Roman Catholic bishops and priests are saying that Masons are setting up the Masonic fraternity against religious institutions! Every Mason knows that that is not true, that it is absolutely false and unfounded.

The Freemason's duty to the Masonic "craft" is the highest duty of man.

That is not so and every Mason knows it. There is not a single duty in a Mason's obligation or a service in a single service in his fraternity that conflicts with the duties of the highest and most honorable citizenship—not one. I will say this—that it is impossible for anyone, gentile or Jew, to be a good Mason without being a good man and a good citizen. I recall, Mr. President, what happened with an old Mason in my State who was lying on his deathbed. He lifted his feeble hand and pointed toward a closet and told his wife to bring him his old, faded vest. He had a Masonic badge that he wore on the lapel of that vest. He had worn it there for years, it had a brass pin, and he had worn it there so long that the green coloring of the brass pin had considerably colored the cloth. He took that vest when his faithful wife had brought it to his bedside, and said: "My dear, I want you to take this badge; and if misfortune ever comes to you, pin it on your bosom and call on some Mason and tell him that you are in distress, and that your husband was a Mason." And then he said: "My son, I have nothing to leave to you of this world's goods. I want you to keep that old worn and faded vest, and I want you to look at the green spot made in the cloth where the pin was worn. Look at it often for just as that old brass pin colored that cloth, the principles of Freemasonry have colored my life and helped me to meet the hour that comes to me now. I must leave you, my boy, but always remember and point with pride to the fact that your father was a Master Mason."

And yet this vile Roman Catholic document that I hold in my hand denounces the great Masonic order. Listen; it says:

Does any one of the inferior brethren know who is the head of Freemasonry? Not one! But who can believe that an organization so extensive as this could continue to exist without a head? It is not possible to accept that opinion. The Masonic "craft" has a head undoubtedly. Why, then, is the fact always denied and concealed?

Listen:

It is because there are very grave considerations which make its concealment imperative.

Listen, Senators:

By no other means can the venomous serpent which has crawled its slimy way to that accursed eminence escape the vengeance of mankind. The head of the Masonic "craft" is a monster, who, if known, could not save himself from the hangman. He would be outlawed in any country in the world.

That comes from this so-called tolerant, temperate, and inoffensive smooth-going Christian institution called the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Listen to this, American Senators:

As compared with the real Freemasonry, the "black hand" society of the Italian Mafia is a praiseworthy organization.

That is enough to read of that vile and lying article. I have never in all my life read such a nasty and mean arraignment of any Catholic fraternal order by any Protestant or Jewish organization.

American Masons have not bothered very much about the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus. They have let them go their way; but here "they" are in their Roman Catholic periodical denouncing the Masonic order, and saying that the criminals in the Mafia band are good citizens compared with those who make up the great Masonic fraternity of the United States.

Mr. President, George Washington was a Master Mason. He wore his Masonic apron and he used the Masonic trowel when he laid the cornerstone of this Capitol. He was worshipful master of the Masonic lodge at Alexandria. I have had the honor to address that lodge 15 or 20 times during my service in Congress. I have sat in the chair that he occupied as worshipful master. I have used the gavel that he used. I have had upon the lapel of my coat the insignia that he wore. I have seen the paraphernalia that adorned him, great Masonic father of his country. Most of his staff in the Continental Army during the War of the Revolution were Master Masons. Four-fifths of the brave and undaunted spirits of those who signed the Declaration of American Independence were Masons, and history records the fact that only one Roman Catholic signed it; and yet in this enlightened day the great Masonic fraternity is traduced and slandered by this Roman Catholic magazine.

Listen to what Washington said about Freemasonry, Senators. This article reads:

Washington, a master Mason, thoroughly imbued with its broad American teachings, said:

"Freemasonry is a fraternity whose liberal principles are founded upon the immutable laws of truth and justice, and whose grand obligation is to promote the happiness of the human race."

Mr. President, when that sheet of the Roman Catholic diocese of Chicago attacks Freemasonry in our country it attacks one of the most illustrious Masons that ever lived, George Washington, first President of the United States. They denounce this institution that is so close to the hearts of millions of patriotic Americans. Are they contributing by such villainous tactics to a closer and more cordial relationship between Roman Catholics and Masonic gentiles and Jews? They know that the Masonic fraternity is a whole-hearted, thoroughly loyal American institution. They know that it stands with drawn sword always on the dividing line twixt church and state, and that is why the Roman Catholic hierarchy hates the Masons of America.

The Roman Catholic clergy and the Roman Catholic press cry "intolerance" and "religious bigotry" when I bring to the attention of the Senate and the country a Roman Catholic conspiracy to embroil our country in war. Then the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri give voice to the same cry in this Chamber and accuse me of injecting religion into the Mexican situation. I deny it, and I resent the charge. It is not true. I have shown to-day to every man and woman of intelligence and common honesty that they injected this issue, and not myself.

The only thing I have done was to uncover and bring to light Mexican war propaganda wherever found. In doing that I brought forth a Mexican war-promoting resolution passed by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus of the United States. It boldly and arrogantly demanded that this Government immediately abandon its present peaceful policy toward Mexico.

Let me read you what the great author of the Declaration of Independence and the father of the Democratic Party said about the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Thomas Jefferson said on December 6, 1813:

History, I believe, furnishes no example of a priest-ridden people maintaining a free civil government. This marks the lowest grade of ignorance, of which their civil as well as religious leaders will always avail themselves for their own purposes.

I have seen enough since this controversy arose to convince me that that is true. For the first time in my life I have been accused of religious prejudice. For the first time in my life I have been charged with being a religious bigot. Nobody in the State where I was born and reared and in whose soil my ancestors sleep ever hinted that I had any religious prejudice

at all. I have not, if I know my own heart. There is nothing of religious bigotry about me.

But, Mr. President, I have learned that if an American Senator in the discharge of his duty to his country catches a Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus promoting a scheme to plunge our country into war and dares to tell it to the American people, he is immediately denounced by the emissaries of the Pope of Rome as a "religious bigot."

Senators recall that when I dared to come in here and tell the truth about the Knights of Columbus and their efforts to involve our country in war, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] took the side of the Knights of Columbus and accused me of injecting a "religious" issue into the controversy and had much to say about religious intolerance and religious bigotry.

Mr. President, it will be a long time before these two gentlemen will be able to get away from and forget the stand they took on that occasion. Mark that prediction. There are people in Maryland and Missouri who are as brave and true American patriots as ever drew the breath of life. They are like the loyal, upstanding Americans of my State. I speak for the South. Talk about religious bigotry and prejudice! We have not got it in the South. It is true that those who serve a foreign potentate and hold allegiance to the Pope of Rome accuse us of intolerance and religious bigotry, when we get in the way of their un-American programs. We will not sit by silently and permit the Pope's program to go through in the American Senate, where real Americans should sit and where real Americans should speak; American statesmen who are not afraid of the underhand and insidious power of the Roman Catholic hierarchy here in the United States.

I have been reminded a number of times that the disclosures I have made are exceedingly dangerous for me personally. I know it is dangerous.

It was a Roman Catholic that shot Roosevelt in the 1912 presidential campaign. Taft was a candidate. Taft had appointed to the Supreme Court bench, as Chief Justice, an able man from the South, a Roman Catholic. He had appointed him Chief Justice of the United States, and had greatly pleased the Roman Catholics; Taft was a candidate for reelection, and Roosevelt was a formidable candidate, and the bullet of a Roman Catholic gun brought him down, but it did not kill him. Roosevelt had offended the Roman Catholic hierarchy. He told Archie Butt, who was associated with him at the White House, that the Roman Catholic Church was out of place in the United States; that it could not grow here; that it was not in harmony with American institutions; that it could grow only by immigration; and in the campaign against Taft he paid for his utterance by being shot by a Roman Catholic.

I know it is dangerous. I suppose I am doing a dangerous thing now, but I am going to tell you another thing: Some of the citizens of the State of Maryland have pledged me that if I was assassinated a number of Roman Catholic priests would suddenly cease to live and that the "political higher-ups" of the Roman Catholic faith would be attended to first.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of using such methods except in extreme, nation-wide emergencies, where a great American question vital to the welfare of the Nation is at stake and foul means have been employed to put out of the way those who espouse the cause of their country. Then it becomes the duty of every brave American patriot to act. In view of the fact that a Roman Catholic tried to kill ex-President Roosevelt and that three Presidents of the United States have been killed by Roman Catholics I am going to make this statement on the floor of the Senate: If anything happens to me, I want what has been written to me from Alabama, Maryland, Texas, and South Carolina to be carried out.

It is not the business of the Senate to know what that particular correspondence is about. It affects me personally because of the fight I am making here as an American Senator to prevent the Roman Catholic hierarchy from using the United States Army to restore the Roman Catholic Church to power in Mexico. If anything happens to me, it will be at the instance of this power and under the direction of that power. It will be planned, all arranged, and ordered. It may not be here. It may be somewhere else. They may plan for it to be under such circumstances that the public would say "they" had nothing to do with it; but I have written and mailed to my friends just what my desires are and just what I would have those whose battle I am fighting to do; and if anything did happen to me, to carry out the program made by loyal Americans.

I am a soldier in the service of the Government of the United States. I have enlisted for life, and I have recently exposed a Roman Catholic war program that gravely concerns

the whole population of the United States. Is it fair to me, is it fair to the country, to permit that "insidious and un-American power" to assassinate me in the United States because I have interfered with the war plans of a Roman Catholic Pope? If a Roman Catholic priest will sit in this gallery and hiss a United States Senator on this floor, while he is speaking against the Roman Catholic war program, if a Roman Catholic priest in New York will print in a so-called Roman Catholic religious paper the bold suggestion that a thug ought to be hired to attack me, if Roman Catholics will write letters to me threatening my life as they have done—one from Boston saying the writer was coming here with 10 others and that they were going to silence me—it shows how mean and murderous the un-American feeling back of all this is. They do not frighten me. Of course, they give me concern, and I have written to these friends who have written to me, in the States I have mentioned, and I have suggested the course I wished pursued in connection with their own suggestion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator from Alabama to say that he has received statements from citizens of Maryland that if he is killed, I, too, will die?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no; the Senator from Maryland was not even mentioned in those communications. He has been mentioned and criticized in many others from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I was going to say, "Then let me die." [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. No; these brave American patriots did not mention the Senator. The Senator from Maryland is already dead. [Laughter.] The Senator is "deader" politically in Maryland than he has any idea of. In view of his recent conduct here, all that is necessary to do in his case is to cross his hands on his chest and put a lily on his breast. [Laughter.] He has done all of that for himself. Sleep on, sweet old admirer of Pericles and John Randolph of Roanoke. Their spirits will keep vigil over thee after the next Senatorial election in Maryland. [Laughter.]

Let me proceed with these statements I was making when the Senator from Maryland interrupted me. It is not a very pleasant thing to be constantly reminded that "certain people" in our midst have designs on my life. It is not pleasant to have them try to get you on the phone to tell you what they think of you. They have tried a number of times to call me at my office, but my red-headed secretary has "cussed" them out and relieved me of that annoyance. They wanted to tell me "just what they thought of me." All these things are annoying and unpleasant, but they will not prevent me from doing my duty as I see it.

Mr. President, all these attempts to embarrass and intimidate me have come about because I dared to read a resolution in the Senate passed by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus, have it printed in the Record, and have helped to defeat so far the Roman Catholic program for war with Mexico. If "they" will do these bold and wicked things now, in this enlightened age, what will they do later on if their numbers increase in the United States and in the Senate?

What do you think would happen to me, Mr. President, if there were a majority of Roman Catholic Senators in this body? They would expel me for disclosures I have made. They would change the rules of the Senate, and they would expunge from the Record a speech like the one I am now making if an American Senator dared to make it. It would be dangerous. Even now, with 90 "so-called" Protestant Senators in this body, it is in a sense unpleasant to stand up and assail the infamous and insidious program of the Roman Catholics to plunge this country into war. Yes, it is in a way unpleasant and dangerous now for an American Senator to stand here day after day and defy and fight their insidious maneuverings. They not only employ the Roman Catholic press, they not only use their weak-kneed Protestant friends on this floor, but they employ the anonymous letter writing thugs to threaten me and to frighten me into silence and submission.

But my answer is—

Rather cast me back into pagan night
To take my chances with Socrates for bliss
Than be the Christian of a faith like this.

I do not intend to yield to it and the country is not going to yield to it. The Roman Catholic hierarchy should dissolve. The Roman Catholic Church in the United States must be born again. It must conform to the rules and regulations of our free institutions or have itself declared as an enemy to them. The independent and individual Catholic, who is already rebelling in some places, according to the article written by the Roman Catholic newspaper man at Cleveland, Ohio, should shake off the shackles of the Roman Catholic clergy and the

Roman Catholic hierarchy and demand that the Roman Catholic Church come out in the open and be in deed and in truth a real American religious institution.

No religious denomination whose presence constitutes a danger and menace to our free institutions has any right to exist in the United States. The Roman Catholics can not lord it over the loyal Protestant and loyal Jewish people of the United States. They can not use the United States Army to fight the battles of the Roman Catholic Church. You must give your allegiance to the United States or keep very quiet when real Americans are insisting on the right and duty to give whole-hearted service to their country.

Now, Mr. President, here is another one of those articles sent out from Washington. It is from George R. Holmes, staff correspondent, Washington, D. C., dated January 19, 1927:

The danger of war with Mexico which has been lurking in the shadows of the land-law dispute has virtually been dispelled.

Thank God! If I have been instrumental in helping to prevent war, I ought to be happy, and I am, for the humble part that I have played. From the letters I have received from all over the country indorsing and praising my stand I feel that I have rendered some service to my country, although I have been slandered and traduced by those whose purposes have been defeated by the work that I have helped to do in this body.

Here is what the New York World said in an editorial on January 13, 1927. The title is, "If you want peace," and it reads:

The extreme gravity of the Latin-American crisis can no longer be doubted. The United States is nearer to war with Mexico than it has been since Pershing's expedition and the landing at Vera Cruz.

If the American people desire to preserve the peace, they have no time to lose in making their will known to the President, his Secretary of State, and to the Congress of the United States.

Senators, it is a praiseworthy work for us to be engaged in an earnest effort to prevent war, to remain at peace with a friendly nation, and to use our efforts and influence to permit our fine American boys to stay in the peaceful pursuits of life in America, living their own lives and solving their own problems unmolested in the paths of peace. We have rendered signal service to our country by letting all those who have and hold secret allegiance to the Pope of Rome know once and for all time that they can not and shall not use the United States Army to fight the battles of the Roman Catholic Church. I have convinced everybody who has sat in the gallery who has listened to me, except about a dozen—and you could not get an idea into their heads with a drill—that this whole Mexican war proposition was a Roman Catholic move. Nobody can deny that. These resolutions that I have read show it. All the correspondence shows it. The statements of Roman Catholic societies and Roman priests and Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus all show it.

Wherein, then, have I offended? Am I to be attacked and lectured by certain ambitious Senators who would like to put a little Roman Catholic oil on the wheels of their presidential candidacy? Are they seeking Al Smith's Roman Catholic strength? The Senator from Maryland has brought Governor Smith's campaign to the floor. He has made the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the vehicle, at the expense of the American taxpayers, to carry through the country a political propaganda for Al Smith. He had printed in the RECORD an article written by some Roman Catholic and signed by George Gordon Battle, of New York, formerly of Virginia. Mr. Battle says in the article that he is a Protestant. There is not a Protestant living who knows that much in the detail about Roman Catholic history. A Roman Catholic wrote that article, I think, and got Mr. Battle, a Protestant—and he says he is a Protestant—to sign it, and they sent it down here and got the Senator from Maryland, who says he is a Protestant, to put it in the RECORD. So a Protestant up in New York "daddied" it and a Protestant from Maryland prints it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now, since they have brought Al Smith's candidacy to this floor, and now, since it has been deliberately brought in here by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE], I feel that I should and I know that I will pay my respects to it.

Mr. BRUCE rose.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator need not rise. I am not half through. It will take me all day to-morrow perhaps to finish.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no!

Mr. HEFLIN. I know that announcement is not pleasant to the Senator from New York, but it does not hurt him half so much as it does the uneasy and restless Senator from the State of Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield now.

Mr. BRUCE. I was going to ask the Senator to yield to me. Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield to the Senator now. I said a little while ago that he was "dead," and he can not come back to life in such a short time. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS]—and a very able and clever gentleman he is—was deploring the fact here the other day that McAdoo was still talking about prohibition and that I was injecting the religious issue into the political situation and that I would offend Roman Catholic Democrats and hurt the Democratic Party. I know the Senator has the Democratic Party's good at heart. Mr. President, I am a Democrat and I love the great Democratic Party, but I always put my country's cause above my party's cause. My country comes first with me. If any Roman Catholic who calls himself a Democrat gets mad with me and quits the Democratic Party because an American Senator has opposed the efforts of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus to involve our country in war with Mexico, let him get mad and let him get out of the party, because the Democratic Party is in every sense of the word truly an American party.

Let me remind the Senator from New Jersey that I know something about how certain so-called Roman Catholic Democrats have used, when they could and betrayed when it was profitable, the great Democratic Party. I was not a delegate but was present at the Democratic National Convention in New York City in the summer of 1924. I occupied a seat on the platform where I could see all over the convention hall. I saw and heard the Roman Catholic advocates of Al Smith in action. They demanded that a Protestant fraternity, known as the Ku-Klux Klan, be condemned and denounced by the Democratic National Convention. They were told that that question should not even be taken up for consideration by the convention—that it would cause friction and division among Democrats and would endanger party success at the national election. They paid no attention to those appeals. They showed no real interest in and no sincere consideration for the Democratic Party then.

I told a number of them that they would disrupt the party and destroy its chance of success, and they said, "To hell with the party if it will not denounce the Ku-Klux Klan." I said, "That is not a question for this convention to consider. It has no place in its proceedings. If you put a plank in the platform denouncing the Ku-Klux Klan, they will amend that provision with another one denouncing the Knights of Columbus."

Nothing would stop them. The Roman Catholic army of Al Smith was on the warpath. They sat up at night working and scheming to have the Democratic platform declare against the Ku-Klux Klan. Party warfare was thrown to the four winds then. Keep in mind the fact that Roman Catholic delegates at the Cleveland, Ohio, Republican National Convention had let the klan subject go by. They did not even raise that question there. Oh, no; they held it back to unload it and explode it in a Democratic National Convention in New York, to help elect a Republican President of the United States. I saw some of the most disgusting, disgraceful, and humiliating things in that New York convention. The Roman Catholic program to denounce the Ku-Klux Klan was nearer and dearer to the Al Smith advocates than was the welfare and success of the Democratic Party. They insisted on carrying the klan issue to the floor of the convention. The committee on platform and resolutions refused to put in the klan proposition, and then the enemies of the Democratic Party, for that is what they were, insisted on having the convention put it in the platform. I saw that grizzled old warrior from Nebraska, grown gray in the service of his party and his country, three times the national standard bearer of the Democratic Party, pleading for party, peace, and harmony, pleading for unity of purpose and party solidarity. I heard him plead with those seeking to destroy the party to withdraw their demand to make the Ku-Klux Klan an issue in the Democratic convention.

But he appealed in vain. When he came up on the platform to make his speech I saw an unruly mob of hoodlums from Tammany hiss him and holler at him, and for some minutes they would not permit him to speak. They insulted and sought to humiliate that great champion of democracy, that great western Democrat. Al Smith's advocates were in the saddle. The Romanists were rampant and on the rampage. I talked to scores of them. "Do not do that," I said. "Let the States handle that question. It has no business here." But they paid no attention to any appeal for the welfare of the Democratic Party. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] made a speech in the convention in favor of denunciation in the Democratic platform. The roll was called on the question about 2 o'clock Sunday morning. When my State, the State of Alabama, with 24 delegates, cast her vote in favor of the Al

Smith program to make the klan an issue in a Democratic convention, I took my hat and left the convention, because I was disgusted and because I knew that my State would not sanction that action. I would not stay there any longer and witness such a disgusting spectacle. I repeat, the Roman Catholic Republican delegates at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1924, did not even mention the klan issue. That "issue" was kept and unloaded on the Democratic convention in New York. Nobody can ever make me believe that the Roman Catholic, Al Smith, and others under his control, did not have a distinct understanding with certain leading Republicans to do just what they did do in the convention in New York City in 1924.

Mr. President, it does not lie in the mouths of Al Smith and his cohorts to lecture me about the wisdom or propriety of my efforts here to prevent the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus from driving this country into war.

Finally, when the delegates of the convention voted, the motion to denounce the klan was defeated by four votes. The convention adjourned over to Monday. Listen, Senators, because I am going to give you some inside political history now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not time to yield now. Sunday morning I went down into the McAlpin Hotel lobby and was talking to various delegates. I found a bunch of Roman Catholics hot on the klan trail again. I said, "What is up now?" They said, "We are going to have a motion to reconsider the vote by which this thing was lost and we are going to have enough votes now to put it over." I said, "Let me tell you something. If you raise that question again, we will not have a shadow of a chance to elect our ticket when this convention adjourns." I then met some of the delegates from my own State and said to them, "Boys, I have not said anything to you about your vote last night to make the klan an issue in the Democratic National Convention, but if you vote to reconsider the vote by which that proposition was defeated I will denounce the delegation over my signature in a statement in Alabama, and I will go to the mat with all of you." So a majority of the Alabama delegation would not agree to vote to reconsider the motion. I am giving Senators some inside history. They were going to move to reconsider that motion Monday morning and go on with their work of division and destruction. What did those rampant Romanists care about the Democratic Party? This is a part of the history of their attempt to destroy the Democratic Party. Let me give you a little more of it.

Al Smith is a candidate for governor of the State of New York, and his political strength in New York is of course the Roman Catholic vote. Everybody knows that. And he has no strength outside in the other States except the Roman Catholic vote. He is their "picked man" and best hope, they think, and they have been praising and boosting him and voting for him for governor with another and a higher object in view. They never would have beat "JIM" WADSWORTH if it had not been for the Roman Catholic deal. So when Al Smith's race came on for governor, let me show you what happened. Mr. Gerard, Al Smith's Roman Catholic right-hand man, was secretary and treasurer of our Democratic national campaign committee, so the funds were handled "amongst friends" in New York, while Al Smith was running for governor. What do you suppose happened?

Listen, Senators! On the day of the election when Al Smith was running for governor, the Democratic nominee and standard bearer for the Presidency, John W. Davis, then living in New York, was traded off and thrown down, while Tammany leaders—Roman Catholics—had on badges, "Al and Cal," "Cal and Al." A Democratic Congressman from New York told me that. He met one of them on the street and said, "What does that mean?" He said, "It means business. We are putting Al and Cal over." That is what it means. And yet the Roman Catholic press warns me to cease my opposition to their war program lest I offend and drive out of the party certain Roman Catholics. Al Smith's crowd will vote the Democratic ticket if they can use the Democratic officials when elected. They will throw the presidential nominee down any time to carry out their plans and purposes in New York City and State. They want control of the city, they want the governorship of the State, and they will trade with the Republican Party at any time to carry New York under those conditions. They have done it time and time again.

I am going to have something to do with the next campaign, and we do not expect to lose much time on New York. We can win the next presidential election without New York. I saw an editorial written by one of the Roman Catholic editors who said that I suggested that Al Smith could not be nominated, and that editor said he wanted to inform me that if he was not nominated, whoever was nominated would not be elected. That proves what I have already said. They are not for the

Democratic nominee unless he suits them, unless they can use him. So it does not frighten me for such Democrats to say that when I am trying to keep my country out of war that I am rocking the Democratic boat. I am going to help to rid my party of all disloyal Democrats. I want to speak for the party now, and I say to any man from the South who challenges this that I will debate the subject with him in his own State. Here it is, the Democratic Party does not intend that the Roman Catholic hierarchy shall use the party as a tail to the Catholic kite. Roman Catholic Democrats of New York must prove their democracy by voting for a Democratic nominee coming from some other State, and they must carry New York State for him.

Mr. President, I said that on account of Al Smith's wet record as governor, having signed an act which virtually withdrew the State of New York from the Union he could not hope to be our presidential nominee. He withdrew State enforcement aid and said, in effect, to the Federal Government, "We have no sympathy with your eighteenth amendment and no support for it." A man who signs a bill like that ought not to be governor much less President. Think of the Christian patriots, the upstanding Americans of the country putting the standard of the Democratic party in his hands to lead our party in the presidential campaign! It will never be the deliberate judgment of American Democrats, mark that.

New York is a liability to the party the way it is run. If Roman Catholic Democrats can not stand up and take their medicine and be loyal Democrats and 100 per cent Americans, let them get out. The presence of some of them in the party is not going to prevent me, as a Democrat, from denouncing their un-American conduct whenever and wherever I find it. I do not care whether a man is a Democrat or a Republican, if he is doing an un-American thing I ought to denounce him, and more particularly if I find him in the ranks of my own party. Any good Democrat will agree to that.

Friday, February 18

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the press reports of my speech yesterday are, in the main, misleading and false. Before I take them up in their order, I call attention to the Washington Post, which has an item reading:

Senator WADSWORTH (Republican), New York, last night called upon newspapers to squelch the religious poison which is being split in the Senate.

The Catholic-controlled press, whose representatives sit in this gallery day after day, by leave of a Protestant American Senator, do not need any suggestion on that line from the Senator from New York. They will not print the truth regarding the issues discussed in this Chamber. I want to read to the Senate what some real Americans, outside of Washington, think about this thing. Everyone should know what is contained in the following statement, which is taken from an address delivered at Christ Mission, New York, December 7, 1924, by Rev. A. Melburnie.

Two years ago an aggressive Roman Catholic propaganda was made in advertisements in the newspapers of Pittsburgh, Pa., and when the Protestants asked for paid space, in the same newspapers, to defend the evangelical position their articles were refused.

Second. That here in America the public press is largely under the control of the influence of Romanism.

Mr. President, the next paper to which I wish to pay my respects is the Baltimore Sun, which is controlled by this Roman Catholic hierarchy. Here is an article in the Sun about a column and a half in length; and I charge that this Roman Catholic-controlled sheet purposely refused to tell the truth contained in my speech of yesterday. The burden of my speech, the main point running through it, was that this resolution to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico was introduced in the House by a Roman Catholic Congressman from New York, and that at the hearings only Roman Catholics were heard, and that the telegrams and the letters and the resolutions offered in support of it were all from Roman Catholics, and that the thing they mention and complain about is Roman Catholic persecution in Mexico and attacks on the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico; and not one of these lying sheets that have gone out from this Capitol, so far as I have yet seen, has given that point to the American people. They have purposely kept it from them.

Mr. President, I am going to raise an issue with a large portion of the press here at the Capitol. If these newspaper men will not give the truth to the country, they ought not to be permitted to sit in that press gallery. If they are to be controlled by an "insidious" influence that will pervert the truth or suppress the truth of what is said here, we have no free press in America.

Listen to this Baltimore Sun article. I had been speaking of the resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus, of the State of Maryland, in which they said their reason for protesting against the Mexican Government was the persecution of Catholics and against the efforts to destroy the Catholic Church. He had not dreamed the Knights of Columbus had adopted a resolution on the subject. The Sun quotes me as saying:

When Senator BRUCE protested he had voiced his own opinion and not that of anybody else.

Senator HEFLIN replied:

I can defeat the Senator in the State of Maryland myself.

See how they have confused and garbled what I did say.

Right there, Mr. President, I read the resolution from the Knights of Columbus, of Maryland, and they make a reference to it, and then deliberately refuse to tell what it was; and that resolution said the Knights of Columbus, of Maryland, were protesting against "the persecution of Catholics and the attempts to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico." Why did not the Baltimore Sun publish that part of the resolution right there?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. Will the Senator from Alabama tell me what his authority is for stating that the Baltimore Sun is Catholic controlled?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am judging by its Roman Catholic subservency; by its reporting everything in favor of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and attacking everything that is said here by American Senators in behalf of America, to keep America out of war for the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Alabama ever seen a list of the stockholders of the company that publishes the Sun?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not care anything about the list of stockholders. There are so many week-kneed, miserable Protestants who are afraid to lift their voices against this Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States that I do not care what names the list shows. I am talking about what that paper is doing; and the Bible says, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Mr. BRUCE. It is not the purpose of the Senator, then, to state that the Baltimore Sun is owned by Catholics?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know who owns it. I am talking about the dominating power, the controlling influence back of it. They may be like some politicians that I know who are playing with "that power" and bowing and doing obeisance to it and hoping to gain favor with it, and not having the courage and the Americanism to stand up and fight it, although the killing of American boys on foreign soil may be involved in their miserable program. That is what I am getting disgusted with. These miserable sheets send out a story and never tell the main thought that ran all through the argument made here. I took two hours and more reading resolutions from Roman Catholics suggesting that they were protesting against the Calles government in Mexico because of the persecution of Roman Catholics, because of an effort to destroy the Roman Catholic Church over there. I read the resolution from the Senator's own State of Maryland, the resolution of the Knights of Columbus, and the burden of that resolution was Roman Catholic persecution, and an attempt to destroy the Roman Catholic Church; and not one of these sheets that I have seen has told that to the country.

Senators, you are going to wake up one of these days to what is going on here at the Capitol. If "this influence" is so dangerous and powerful now, what will it be 25 years from now? If Senators now will "truckle to it" or "flee from it" when it raises its hand, and seek cover whenever the issue is brought into the open, what will happen if the power of the Pope is increased about the press gallery and in this body?

I will tell you what is going to happen. The American people are waking up, and I want them to wake up. I want every Senator who comes up for reelection next year to be asked, "Were you in sympathy with Senator HEFLIN or were you against him when he was fighting to prevent the Roman Catholic hierarchy from driving us into war with Mexico? Were you giving him encouragement and support or were you bowing and smiling to the Pope?"

The Baltimore Sun has been a great paper in the past. It is no longer that. The influence that dominates it now is un-American. It is dangerous to the genius of free institutions. It suppresses the truth. It is against the best interests of the

Government. It lies in its report of to-day about my speech of yesterday.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator wants me to yield again, I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator think that tolerance is un-American?

Mr. HEFLIN. Tolerance?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. My God! Tolerance with your Roman Catholic friends means meek and humble submission to everything the Roman Catholic hierarchy does or says. It means silence and cowardice on the part of real Americans when the "righteous" power of the Pope is in question.

Mr. BRUCE. I think such language as that is unworthy of an answer.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Maryland can not make any answer to it. There are those here and elsewhere who do truckle to this power. There are those who are as afraid of "it" as they are of death. There are those who court favor with "it" all the time, and I regret to say that there are those who are just as much under "that control" as if they were Roman Catholics themselves. Now, that truth will go to the country. It will go in this Record if it can not go in the newspapers.

Here is another one—the New York Times. Listen: Here are the headlines:

Catholics assailed again by HEFLIN.

In three-hour speech he denounces church, charging it sought war with Mexico.

Links Sheffield to "plan."

Envoy defended by WADSWORTH—Cardinal controls candidates of both parties, Alabamian asserts.

And not once do they state that I read to the Senate telegrams from Roman Catholic priests, resolutions from the Holy Name Society and other Roman Catholic organizations, resolutions from the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus of Maryland, letters galore from Roman Catholics to the committee, all pointing out that Roman Catholics as Roman Catholics were protesting because of Roman Catholic persecution and an attempt to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico.

Why will not these papers tell the truth? What influence is it that will prevent a paper like the New York Times from telling the truth? What will make that paper truckle, dodge, evade, and become the tool of this insidious power? And yet its representatives are here.

Mr. President, the people will have to arrange a different situation with regard to getting the truth to the country from the press gallery at the Capitol. This influence is too strong up there. There are some men up there who are honest and who are brave, but some of them can not write what they want to write. This "insidious power" is reaching its hands into every nook and corner of the country, and scores and scores of papers are not permitted to tell the truth about what takes place here. Senators, that is a very serious situation.

Why did not the New York Times say that "Senator HEFLIN showed by the facts that this was a Roman Catholic movement?"

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] helped to raise this issue with me, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. They said that I had injected the religious issue because I discussed the position taken by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus, discussed their resolution; and when I came here yesterday and proved that not I but that they injected the religious issue, and that the "religious issue" really was at the bottom of the Roman Catholic movement for war with Mexico, these papers refused to tell the truth to the American people. And yet the people continue to support these unfair and untruthful papers.

Let me appeal to the Protestants and the Jews of America who believe in fair play, and who are opposed to this sort of crooked and corrupt control of our press, to quit supporting these papers. Let me tell you what happened to one paper in Missouri the other day, the one I read about yesterday, the one that called me a bigoted ass, the Springfield News, a newspaper took issue with them, called them to task; scores of Protestants wrote in and stopped their subscriptions, nearly half of them, I am told, in a week; and then the paper came out and filled nearly its whole front page with my speech without comment. That is what you have got to do. You have got to assert yourselves. You have got to quit supporting such papers, I am speaking now to the people who are reading this Record:

Quit taking these papers. Make your influence felt. Do not support papers that tell lies, suppress the truth and injure your country. Let this insidious Roman Catholic hierarchy support them and keep them up. Start another paper against them. They are not giving us a fair deal at Washington. They are suppressing the truth. They just will not tell the truth.

Now, I will take up another one.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. BRUCE. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama what he means by saying that the Baltimore Sun is Catholic controlled. Does he mean that the holders of the stock of the publishing company of the Baltimore Sun, or a majority of them, are Catholics? Does the Senator mean that?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know anything about that, and I do not care.

Mr. BRUCE. What does the Senator mean? It is hard for me to find something the Senator does know something about.

Mr. HEFLIN. I know by its acts that this influence is controlling the Sun. The stockholders are not caring about anything except clipping coupons. Those who write the stories that appear in the paper are the people who control its news policies. They shape its policies. They are making the paper do what they want it to do, that is what I am talking about.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator mean, then, that expressions of tolerance on the part of a newspaper are evidence that it is controlled by the Catholic Church? If that is what the Senator means, so much the better for the Catholic Church.

Mr. HEFLIN. Tolerance! There goes the Senator from Maryland on tolerance again! The Senator is still harping on "tolerance," as he has come to understand it from his Roman Catholic environment, and he is still criticizing the position of an American Senator who has dared to expose the miserable and mean war program of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus.

Mr. BRUCE. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I can not yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. Just one more.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, ask that one more.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator mean, then, that he thinks the Baltimore Sun is Catholic controlled because it condemns the language of squalid and inflammatory bigotry upon the floor of the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, what I mean is exactly what I say, that I know this paper is now dominated by this "insidious influence" because it would not tell the truth about the speech that I made here yesterday when I discussed a thing of vital interest to ninety-odd million American people. I told the truth, and they would not publish it. No man on this floor, not even the intolerant and bigoted Senator from Maryland, challenged the truth of my statements.

I fear the trouble about the Senator from Maryland is that the bent of his mind and the trend of his sympathies are toward the altar place of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, while mine are on the side of my country. I dared, in my place as a Senator, to expose this miserable effort to involve us in war, and for doing that the Senator from Maryland was first to rise in this body and criticize and condemn my utterances. I knew why the Senator did that. The Roman Catholic vote controls the city of Baltimore, and no Protestant can be elected there in opposition to that vote, and I have but little respect for an "American" who will shape his creed for his craving and swallow his convictions for a job.

Is that bigotry? Is that religious intolerance? It is truth. The time is coming, if it is not already here, when Americans at the ballot box, the ark of the covenant in our civic affairs, must say, "Are the candidates able, honest, capable Americans? Is there any power on earth that they put above that of the United States in their heart of hearts? Have they any divided allegiance? We wish to put none but Americans on guard."

Are they for America first, last, and all the time? Are their secret obligations to the Roman Catholic hierarchy in conflict with their duty to the United States Government? Have they ever been initiated into what is called "the honorary inner circle"—a secret order in the hierarchy where it is said they confer a degree upon "desirable Protestants"? In other words, are those who are running for office, by blood or otherwise, tied in any way to the Roman Catholic hierarchy?

Mr. President, I have never been accused of having any religious prejudices in all of my life until the charge was made by the Senator from Maryland, who is now serving his last term in the Senate. [Laughter.] Do not laugh at that. It is too serious a thing to laugh at. His political days are num-

bered, and he caused them to be numbered himself. I know his State. The rank and file of the Democratic Party outside of the city of Baltimore are already up in arms against his attacks upon me, and the cause that I represent in this body. They are not ready to march the soldiers of Maryland to the Mexican border to prevent Mexican attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church; and when I denounced the un-American effort to do that the Senator from Maryland attacked me, and I am going to suggest to Governor Ritchie that he had better silence the Senator from Maryland.

The Senator from Maryland is not in any way helping the distinguished Governor of Maryland by insisting on injecting his defense of the Roman Catholic hierarchy into an American Senator's speech.

But, Mr. President, I was about to pay my respects to the New York World. [Laughter.] That Roman Catholic editor up there has attacked me viciously several times since I exposed the efforts of the Knights of Columbus to involve us in war with Mexico. Listen to this plain, unvarnished falsehood:

When HEFLIN finished his speech, he said something about "I will 'git' the floor to-morrow."

They have quotations around the statement that I said that "I will 'git' the floor to-morrow"; with emphasis on the "git." They state that I said "I will 'git' the floor."

Why do you suppose that Roman Catholic writer wanted to put that lie in the paper? I did not say that. Every Senator here knows that I did not say it. And they say that when I said that I would get the floor if I wanted it, "There were groans from the floor and in the galleries." That is not true. It is absolutely false. No such thing occurred.

There was not a groan upon the floor, nor was there a groan in the galleries, nothing but approval of my course from the galleries at any time during my speech. But that false statement has gone out in the New York World. That appears in the New York World, up in Al Smith's home State, and the Senator from Maryland has not condemned that falsehood which was told on me and told on the Senate and told on the untarnished Americans who sit in this gallery and hear debates for the purpose of getting the truth, because they can not get it in the Roman Catholic controlled press.

The Washington Star, a Republican paper, has in times past been, I thought, very fair.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield to the Senator from Maryland any more.

Mr. BRUCE. I just wanted to ask a single question. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the entire enlightened press of the country are against him?

Mr. HEFLIN. All those newspapers, like the Roman Catholic controlled Senators, who I know are against me. Those who are controlled by the Roman Catholic influence, as some Senators, I think, are controlled by that influence, are against me. I hope that will satisfy the long-time disciple of old Pericles.

Here is the Washington Star. It goes on to tell a little running story of some of the things of minor consequence, but it does not mention the main point in the speech, the thought that ran all through it, and that is that the whole scheme was started and carried on by Roman Catholics and that it was because of so-called persecution of Roman Catholics in Mexico, and about an attempt to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico. Even the Washington Star has left that out and has not given its readers a single line about it. What influence is it that has caused that paper to change? It used to be a very fair paper. It would give both sides and give the things as they occurred; but it has changed.

Now I come to the Washington Herald, a story written by Fraser Edwards, a very clever writer, and a very clever boy, a son of my old-time friend, Charlie Edwards. I take it that they cut out a part of his story, because nothing appears in this report which carried the real point in my speech. I made it as plain as language could make it, backed up by evidence coming from Roman Catholic sources, that this whole movement was started by them, and that all of these telegrams and resolutions referred to Roman Catholic activities and the effort to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico; but not a line of it appeared in the Washington Herald—a Roman Catholic controlled paper.

Senators, are we going to submit in silence to these things? Some of you may not be thinking much about this now, but when you get home and your people begin to talk to you, you will think about it when you are making your speeches and some man or woman rises in the audience and says, "Senator, may I ask you a question?"

"Yes."

"Were you in the Senate when Senator HEFLIN read the resolution of the Knights of Columbus in Philadelphia demanding that the President sever diplomatic relations with Mexico?"

"Yes."

"Were you there when he read where they denounced this Government for its policy toward Mexico?"

"Yes."

"And where they demanded that this policy must immediately cease?"

"Yes."

"And where they pledged the support of 800,000 Knights of Columbus to aid the Knights of Columbus in Mexico who were trying to overthrow the Government which this Government had recognized?"

"Yes."

"And where they pledged themselves to raise a million dollars to help carry on propaganda aiding the Knights of Columbus over there against the position taken by their Government here in the United States?"

"Yes."

"Were you there when Senator HEFLIN commented on that, and said the Government should not be used to fight the battles of any religious group in a foreign country, that the United States Army should not be used to further the cause of the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico?"

"Yes."

"That it ought to be used only to uphold American rights and interests and American principles?"

"Yes."

"Do you subscribe to his position on that? Were you with him in that controversy? Do you not think he took the American stand?"

Those are the questions that are going to be asked you, and I am making them so simple that all they will have to do is to cut them out of the RECORD. Then they will say more to you:

"Were you there when Senator HEFLIN spoke three hours and a half and read into the RECORD all those letters from members of the Roman Catholic Church complaining about the persecution of Roman Catholics, and an effort to destroy the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico, showing that it was a Roman Catholic move entirely?"

"Yes."

"Were you there when he read those messages from Roman Catholic priests on the same line?"

"Yes."

"And all those telegrams from the Holy Name Society, a Roman Catholic institution?"

"Yes."

"Don't you think he proved his case that it was a Roman Catholic movement from the beginning, and that no Protestant or Jew had engaged in it, but that it was solely a Roman Catholic movement vigorously pressed forward by the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in the United States?"

"Yes."

"Are you with him on that proposition, Senator? Did you not hear him read in the Senate the press statement that the Roman Catholic priests of Mexico were disappointed because they were not going to get military help from the United States?"

"Yes."

"Then finally are you a whole-hearted, 100 per cent American? Did you support Senator HEFLIN? Do you mind my writing a letter to him and asking him if you gave him encouragement or if you tried to hinder him in the American fight that he was making?"

Those are some of the questions which will be propounded to you, and if you have told me, as many of you on both sides have and congratulated me on my speech and on my stand, that you were with me and encouraged me, I am going to write a good letter and tell them the truth about it, and if you have not done that I am going to tell the truth about your position and lay your record bare, and, oh Lord! will not it be a scorching letter when I come to write about the Senator from Maryland? [Laughter.] Brilliant and able Senator that he is, what a pity that in his old age he should be found indulging in the tactics in which he is indulging to-day.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I inquire about how long he expects to speak this afternoon? We are very anxious to pass the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which has been before the Senate now for nearly a week. We did not have any opportunity to proceed with it on yesterday and the bill really should be considered, passed, and sent to conference.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think I can finish in four hours.

Mr. PHIPPS. I presume the Senator's estimate is no more accurate than his estimate was yesterday when he told me he would speak one hour, and then occupied four hours without finishing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Since the Senator has made his statement I probably will now speak only a couple of hours.

Mr. PHIPPS. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator came to me yesterday and made some inquiry about how long I would speak. I said probably an hour or a little more, but I had no idea that it would take me as long as it did, and I did not get half through with the facts which I had to submit for the RECORD so that the people could read them. I had not intended to speak as long as I did, but I was interrupted three or four times, and that caused me to speak more at length. I shall not occupy the floor very much longer to-day.

I want to bring to the attention of the Senate just what the Government of the United States is up against right here with a subsidized and Roman Catholic controlled press. To-day we are in the grip of a power which so controls the situation that we can not get the truth to the country through the press. It is an alarming situation, and something has got to be done. Why should we submit to it? It may be that the Government will have to adopt the plan of printing a bulletin every day. Let the Government publish each day a bulletin; and let the people of the United States subscribe for it at a dollar a year; and let both sides of the question be printed each day in the bulletin in order that the people who are not able to pay for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the truth come to them from the Capitol in such a congressional bulletin.

Mr. President, I have about finished what I desire to say. In fact, I would not have spoken as long as I have, but for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE]. I have no apology to make for anything I have said. I have told the whole truth and I intend to see that the people of the country get that truth. I would not submit to a protestant secret hearing at the Capitol. I would not submit to a protestant movement to involve my country in war without denouncing that movement.

I repeat, I commit no sin, I do not care what the Roman Catholic Pope says, when I prefer to serve my country rather than "that influence." I do no un-American act when I stand and plead for my country against the insidious workings of those who would involve it in war to aid the Pope of Rome in Mexico. And I do not apologize to anybody for that statement.

Of course, I knew that I would be attacked by the Roman Catholic press, as I have been. They have already threatened me in various ways—threatened me politically. I have always done what I thought was right in politics. I have never been controlled by a local machine, nor by a State machine, nor by a national machine of any character. I have always fought for what I believed was right. I have taken my political life in my hands whenever I did it, and I am willing to take the consequences of my acts now. I know when my conscience and judgment tell me that I am right that I ought to rise and speak.

The villainous New York World said in an editorial the day before I disclosed this Roman Catholic movement to put us into war:

Wake up! You are nearer to war than you have any idea.

I rose and spoke, and when I did so the Senator from Maryland, able and learned Senator that he is—he was once a very courageous and brilliant man, but now how the mighty have fallen—came in and assailed me for the stand that I took, as did the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], attacking me for "raising a religious issue."

On yesterday for two hours I read Roman Catholic documents sent to the committee of the House in the hearings, reciting that their grievance was the persecution of Roman Catholics in Mexico and the effort to destroy the Roman Catholic Church; the resolution of the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in Senator BRUCE's own State raising the question of the persecution of Roman Catholics and of the efforts to destroy the Roman Catholic Church, showing that nobody but Roman Catholics were heard by the committee; that all the letters and all the telegrams and all the resolutions were written and passed by Roman Catholics; that it was a Roman Catholic movement; that the resolution was introduced in the House by a Roman Catholic. I told the Senate on yesterday that I did not inject the issue, but that they had done it themselves, and yet not one newspaper so far as I can find to-day has told that simple truth to the country. Senators, what are we coming to here at the Capitol?

EXHIBITS

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., February 9, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading your messages to Congress in which you so gloriously had the courage to beard the Knights of Columbus lion in his den and exposed their hellish plot that I am prompted to say: Hail to thee, courageous spirit! Martin Luther of the twentieth century!

What a joy it was to know that at least one Senator in Washington has had the manly courage to tell the truth; for the truth it was. Perhaps now, since you have blazed the trail, other formerly cowardly Senators will have the nerve to get up and speak what they know to be the truth. No longer can the Roman Catholic gang boast, "Although the Roman Catholic population of the United States numbers only one-fifth of the entire population, yet they fear us," as they have boasted in one of their church periodicals. I cordially detest those of our Protestant clergy who are always harping on toleration and boasting of the fact that their "dearest bosom friend is a Roman Catholic priest." * * * Bah! The cowards! * * * I am glad to read that the Pope of Rome, figuratively speaking, slapped old Bishop Brent, the Episcopalian bishop, in the face when he refused his invitation to attend the world conference on faith and order to be held in Switzerland within a few months. Bishop Brent humbly begged him to attend, and he refused. During the eucharistic show in Chicago Cardinal Mundelein invited the Protestant (?) ministers to attend the show, and the poor, craven creatures accepted.

There is the difference. Our ministers are humble and cowardly, while the Roman Catholic hierarchy is arrogant and dominating.

When will they wake up? Dear Senator, a man of your courage is what this country needs at its head in the presidential chair. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

HARRIET FIELD.

TEXARKANA, ARK.-TEX., January 31, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I want to congratulate you in the stand you took and the information you gave the Senate in the Nicaragua-Mexican situation.

The heart of every true American goes out in gratitude to you. You have rendered your country a valuable service. The country was slow in believing that the present administration was bent on carrying out the dictates of Catholicism and capitalism to break with and make war on Mexico, that capitalism might continue to despoil Mexico and that Catholicism might continue its strange hold upon that ignorant, debased, and priest-ridden people. Oh, how a Tom Watson was needed there to stand by you.

Will Senators and Congressmen, and supposedly good American citizens, never awake to the danger that confronts our country? Can't they see that there is no Christianity in Catholicism, that it is simply a great political system, masquerading under the guise of religion, using every means, fair and foul, to capture America for the Pope? To this end they are moving earth and hell to elect Al Smith president. The fight against Alcohol Smith must be made now, we can't afford to wait until the convention meets, and let the two-thirds rule be abrogated. If so, he is sure of the nomination. While he would not be elected, yet, his nomination would wreck the Democratic Party. Your speech has done more to put a crimp in Smith's candidacy than anything that has as yet occurred.

Again thanking you, I am with great respect.

Sincerely yours,

LEGRAND W. JONES.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., February 2, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: The writer wishes to congratulate you on your able and valiant defense of Americanism.

The following quotation of Abraham Lincoln shows clearly how well Lincoln understood the enemy: "Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

This quotation appeared in the 1927 Everyman's Almanac, published by the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

If you are not already familiar with it, I hope it will be interesting and of value.

Yours truly,

H. A. ANDERSON.
70 North Thomas.

DE KALB, ILL., January 31, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Senator from Alabama,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN: I wish to congratulate you on your grand and noble stand in exposing before Congress the scheming of the Knights of Columbus to drag this country into war with Mexico. It is a time when all true Americans must be on guard against the enemy that would destroy our God-given liberties that have been so dearly bought and paid for by our forefathers. We must keep secure the liberties they have given us, so that we may pass them on to our children and to generations to follow. No greater foe have we to contend with than the Roman Catholic Church. It is the same to-day as it has been in the ages past. It is beyond redemption.

I regret exceedingly that there were not other men in Congress with true American blood in their veins to stand by you in your brave stand. You have shown yourself a man among men to expose yourself to such slander and persecution that the Roman Catholic Church will undoubtedly put against you. But be not afraid. The American people are behind you to the last ditch and will stick with the guns. Keep the good work going. This country needs a leader that will fearlessly bring the battle into the camps of the real enemies of this country. You have proven yourself a faithful patriot to your country, and the American people are thanking God for such a man as you.

With faith in Almighty God, and Him to guide and lead you, victory will be yours. God bless you.

For America first, last, and always,

AXEL RYDEN.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., February 1, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have noticed lately in the public press several articles regarding your speeches before the Senate regarding the Mexico affair. Of course, the press does not print much of those speeches, or print them in full as they should. However, in one of the Washington papers I notice a very complete account of one of your speeches, and I want to congratulate you on your American courage. You realize that there are few men in public life to-day who have courage to stand up and tell the things that they really know about that un-American bunch. I am satisfied that you have their number and to the mind of any reasonable person and one who keeps in touch with their doings, you certainly only said what were the facts in the case.

Of course, you must realize that it will mean almost retirement for you. That crowd of outlaws will get you some way. They will first declare a political boycott against you. They will harass you in every method known to their craft, even to assassination if that will be the only means to get rid of you. They won't, of course, stab you in front, but they might do so in the back as that is their method of doing business. You will, of course, never get another Catholic vote in the State of Alabama, and there are perhaps some jelly-fish Protestants who will vote against you in sympathy with the Pope's crowd. But it is more honor to be defeated by Americans than to be elected by the help of that crowd. However, you can now expect the fate of poor old Thomas Watson, who they hounded till he died, and at that he was worth more than all the subjects that the holy Pope has in this country. He was sure a 100 per cent American.

I have always voted the Republican ticket, but I would want no greater privilege than to be able to cast a vote for you, and I would not care what ticket you run on or what office you wanted, as you are the brand of American that I admire.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. MOYER.

KERRVILLE, TEX., February 9, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your speech in the United States Senate on the Mexican situation. It is doing more to bring to light the real situation than all else that has been said on the subject to date. I inclose a page taken from the last issue of Columbia, the official organ of the Knights of Columbus, published at New Haven, Conn. It explains the work of that organization and what they are doing with the million dollars raised to crush the Calles government in Mexico. It confirms your statement in the Senate and shows conclusively what they are doing to fool the people.

May God bless your good work in the furtherance of preserving our American institutions.

Yours truly,

D. R. LEWIS.

POTWIN, KANS., February 10, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I am deeply interested in you and admire you for the stand you have taken upon the Senate floor in defense of your country and my country.

I want to congratulate you, and thank you for the manly expression of thought you gave before the Senate in behalf of the people of the United States, the interest displayed in keeping our country out of war with Mexico. Do not let the Pope's militia, the Knights of Columbus, bring war upon us if it is in your power to prevent it.

Let not your thoughts be intimidated by them. Millions of people are watching you. Hundreds of thousands of praying people are asking the one God to bless your mind and fill it with wisdom and give you strength to endure. The people of our land have been praying: God give us men; men who dare to think. It is your type of manhood this country needs for President of our United States.

When a country needs a man to save it, God raises up just such a man as you and Lincoln to save it. I hope to see you elected President of our glorious Nation.

Respectfully yours,

U. G. RUSSELL.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., February 5, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for your fearless stand you have taken in the United States Senate for Americans in regard to the Mexican situation and the Knights of Columbus request to intervene on behalf of their religion.

Let me further state that if I personally had the time I could get at least 10,000 signatures to this letter here in Springfield, Mo.

Hoping that you keep up your good work, no doubt you will be repaid.

I am, as all God-fearing Americans,

FLOYD JONES.

P. S.: General Washington once said, "Put only Americans on guard."

F. J.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, M. S.,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Undeniably, the great need of the hour is the presence in the Congress of statesmen who have the ability to discern, and the courage to strike, the insidious enemies of our country.

I desire, therefore, to commend your recent expose in the Senate of the Roman Catholic intriguing; to compliment you on your courage and patriotism, and to assure you that four-fifths of the people of the country are with you. Consensus of opinion throughout the Middle West is that our United States troops have about as much business in Nicaragua or Mexico as Kellogg—with his "Bolshevik" nightmare—has in heaven.

Since the press virtually ignored your wonderful senatorial addresses, as it does all 100 per cent American matter, don't you think the Government should erect a broadcasting station at the Capital and require all speeches delivered in the House and Senate to be put on the air so that the American people could get the facts and information available there, and not be choked off by a "kept" press as they are now?

Due to your courage and 100 per cent Americanism, thousands upon thousands of Iowa Republicans would welcome an opportunity to vote for you for President of the United States, not the least among them being,

Yours very truly,

DAN W. RICHARDS,
1201 South Second Street West.

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE,
Monday, January 31, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: While reading our local paper the Star and Herald of Panama City, I read where you claimed the Knights of Columbus were spending money to spread propaganda to cause war with Mexico.

Inclosed find three pamphlets that were mailed to me by some one on the Canal Zone, no name signed.

I am the wife of a Shriner and a Christian Scientist in faith and religion. Perhaps they think to catch the unwary Protestant into donating to their cause, as many of them do without even inquiring the cause, or reading their literature. I do not think that Mexico wants war with the United States, or anyone, but I do think the Pope of Rome does. It looks a great deal like the spark that started

the World War, that spark was small also. It seems only a small excuse is needed to sacrifice our sons for no gain or reason at all.

Sir, we of the Canal Zone admire and laud your stand, and although we have no vote we are interested in all red-blooded American efforts to save our great country and her sons.

Sincerely yours,

NILES, MICH., February 5, 1927.

The Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Building Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: I, as an American citizen of the United States of America, wish to express my sincere appreciation of your fearless stand you are taking for the cause of America and pure Americanism, and in expressing my sentiments here I wish also to include the same sentiments of a host of real red-blooded Americans of Niles, Berrien County, Mich. Go to it, and we as Americans will stand behind you until the walls around the Pope of Rome crumble into dust.

May Almighty God give you strength to carry on in your good work.

Yours sincerely,

CHAS. C. MCINTYRE.

KEWANEE, ILL., February 5, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as I have been reading different parts of your talks in Senate through the papers I can not help but writing you in regards to the fearless stand you are taking against the Mexican situation, whereby the Knights of Columbus are trying to get this Nation to declare war on Mexico.

You are to be congratulated, and you surely have a big host of people supporting you throughout the United States. You need all the encouragement in the world, and I hope the Protestant organizations will back you up as the Knights of Columbus and organizations of their kind back up the Senators opposed to you and the thing that you are doing.

Yours respectfully,

DON C. MAYHEW.

P. S.: We need more Senators with the backbone like yours—one of marrow and not of jelly.

JACKSONVILLE, ILL., February 5, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept congratulations in the stand you have taken in keeping us out of war with Mexico.

Yours sincerely,

EDNA LONGHAVY.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., January 31, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We, as Protestant American citizens, who are ever alert to the dangers which you have so fearlessly made known to the American public, desire to extend our manifold appreciation of your love and patriotism toward our glorious country.

May your stirring remarks take their place with those of other patriots whose words have outlived them. May they be preserved for future generations to read. May they be an inspiration to Senators of other States, that they, too, may rally to the support of our God-given ideals as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

If ever our country needed men of courage and sterling character, it needs them now. You have proven yourself to be one of these, and it is our sincere wish that there may in the near future be more Heflins in the United States Senate.

With hearty approval and best wishes, we are,

BERKSHIRE KLAN, No. 9,
Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan.

Attest:

J. C. KILMER, Secretary.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., February 6, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you a line congratulating you on the patriotic stand you have taken in reference to the Mexican affair.

Thanks to God that we have at least one Senator who deems it unnecessary to knuckle down to Romanism. God be with you in your difficult task.

Very truly yours,

ED H. VISSERING,
1204 North Park Street.

MENDOTA, ILL., February 7, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit me at this time to compliment you on the stand you have taken in the Senate on the Mexican question. I think you have shown yourself to be a real American, and that you are interested in our country first, and even with the strong anti-American talking was not able to swing you from what you thought was your duty to tell the people of this great country.

I feel sure that you can be depended on to stand for the bill which is in the Senate regarding that only native-born Americans be allowed to hold the offices of Senators and Congressmen.

Let me again thank you for the stand you have taken, and it is a pleasure to me to let you know that the public is surely back of you in all such moves you make in the Senate. I remain,

Yours very truly,

JAS. C. BRIGGS,
P. O. Box 614.

WAUKEGAN, ILL., February 7, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Member of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am one just like the vast majority of honest and loving American citizens who in memory of the fathers that laid the cornerstone of this our great American Government and love their country above any country on earth—we yell, hurrah!—and the stand you have taken against the Roman hierarchy and that American gang of Knights of Columbus who want to embroil us into a war with Mexico to benefit the Roman hierarchy.

I want to thank you as an American for your fearlessness on the floor of our United States Senate to tell that sleeping body of United States Senators facts—the truth and nothing but the truth. Oh, I wish God would let in the light of true Americanism into the hearts of your brother Senators to rid our country forever from Roman propaganda, who want to kill the principles that our fathers fought and bled and died for.

In closing I want to say, "Keep on, you good Americans; up and on to save our country." Hope and my blessing that the Almighty God will always be with you and keep your precious life for our Nation in this tragic hour.

Yours,

ROSS C. COAN,
2000 West Washington Street.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 5, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: May I at this time offer to you my felicitations in the stand taken by you on the Senate floor recently in regard to the present situation between the state and church of Mexico, and the Knights of Columbus in our great country.

I am satisfied that it takes a big man to stand where you did and say the things that were heard there at that time regardless of what persecution may befall you.

Keep up the good work, Senator, and some day the populace may awaken to the fact that their country is being slowly but surely moved to the papal gardens in Rome. It will be a hard fight for those awake, but these broad-minded persons can be bumped good a few times and then the battle will be won.

If in printed form, I would appreciate any reading matter on the subject that you have. In other words, the records of your speeches.

Truly,

J. L. BRENNAN,
7055 St. Lawrence Avenue.

PUEBLO, COLO., February 14, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND HONORABLE CITIZEN: As I have been reading your speeches on the floor of the United States Senate regarding the policy of the United States toward old Mexico, I want to extend my hearty congratulations for same. I regard those speeches you have made as an eye opener to some of the American people. I hope there is a time coming when I can vote for you for President of these old United States of America, to extend to you my appreciation for what you are doing for your and my country.

I will say I am a Republican, but the kind of a Republican that will vote a Democratic ticket, which I have done in the past, and expect to do in the future. As words will not express my respect for you, I will extend my very best wishes to you a long and prosperous happy life to you and family, and all who are near and dear to you.

Your friends and admirers,

MR. and MRS. F. E. HICKS,
1351 East Second Street.

HARRISBURG, ILL., February 5, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As I am a 100 per cent American and a loyal voter for the right man in the White House, I ask you to go your length in keeping out those foreigners, both women and children and men, from America. Keep them out of here.

Also make the prohibition law stronger, as the people are very much interested in those two laws.

Yours truly, voters of Illinois,

Mrs. and Mr. W. W. FLEMING.

SELLECK, WASH., February 1, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to tell you that you are 100 per cent American. You are the real thing. Have guts. And I only wish you have Tom Watson, of Georgia, to stand with you (old Tom that was).

I am referring to that speech you made in the Senate, when you said "the Catholic Church wanted war with Mexico."

Now, I am not going to take up your time with a lot of guff. You and BORAH would be my choice for President and Vice President next year. Let me add that our ship of state is in pirate hands. Coolidge is a wooden man. Wall Street and the Pope run the United States. Mr. HEFLIN, you have courage. I will take off my hat to you. I wish I knew you. There is one man in this county that knows you.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours,

F. B. SIDELINGER.

I am a Mason and Moose.

EAST CANTERBURY, N. H., February 8, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand on the Mexican question and to thank you for your speeches.

I hope, for the sake of these good old United States, that you will fight it to a finish.

I surely wish when we next vote on a President I could have the extreme pleasure of voting for you, and I am usually on the Republican side.

I wish our Senator MOSES had half of your courage on this question.

Yours,

EUGENE G. HAIGHT.

NATIONAL CITY, CALIF.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your stand in the Senate against the growing menace of the Roman Catholic Church.

May God bless you.

We need a man like you for President of the United States.

JAMES LYON.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., February 2, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a Republican and an ex-Union soldier, but I want to approve every word you have uttered concerning the Knights of Columbus and Catholics.

I would like to vote for you for President.

AN AMERICAN.

WHITE PIGEON, MICH., February 16, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It gave me a great deal of pleasure when I read your speech and the stand you took in the Senate and defended our American principles and showed to the world that America was not to be dominated by Roman rule.

I am glad to know that we have such men as you in our Senate Hall at Washington, and I feel that you have a host of Americans who honor you in the stand you have taken, and that they are asking God to give you strength and courage to stand by your guns.

Allow me to congratulate you.

I hope you will realize that you have millions who are anxious for your success.

America needs at this time men of your type, and I hope that your own State will see to it that you are kept in the honorable seat that you now have.

If you have any tracts on the Mexican situation I would be glad to receive some.

Never lower your standard.

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. BROOKWAY.

ELGIN, ILL., February 14, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEFLIN: I was so glad to read of your speech to the Senate; and if only more men who call themselves true Americans would be strong to stand against the many foes of our Government and our home life we might feel safer.

I am glad you have the courage of your convictions and are not afraid to stand for what you know is right. It does take courage, as we all realize; and perhaps it will help you and strengthen you to know that you have the prayers and backing of many thousands of people who can see the many subtle foes that attack us on all sides, but who are not in authority to strike at these except by our vote, and to cheer you who are fearless to speak the truth. Many who have seemed indifferent and skeptical were stirred to action by your speech.

May God give you added strength and courage to stand for right always.

Yours truly,

E. W. MASON.

WHITE PIGEON, MICH., February 16, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Have been reading several accounts of your stand on the Mexican situation and wish to commend you for same.

I am heartily in accord with you and can not help but believe that there are some direct representatives of the Pope of Rome back of the movement to try to get the United States in war with Mexico.

More power to you.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES SISSON.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We as American citizens are indebted to you for the noble stand you are so ardently taking in upholding the principles upon which our country was founded. We regret that our fair State of Illinois which produced such noble men as Lincoln, Grant, and Logan has not at this time a Representative who could stand by you and assist you in this great patriotic work you are so nobly doing.

May Divine Providence guide and protect you until you have accomplished your God-given mission and success has crowned your efforts.

With deepest gratitude to you, our country's defender, we are

Most sincerely yours,

DR. and MRS. O. L. MEDSKER,
10743 South State Street.

ST. JOHNS, MICH., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED FRIEND AND TRUE AMERICAN: I wish to congratulate you for the courageous stand you have taken in the Senate in regard to the Mexican trouble, and other true American ideals.

I pray and hope other Senators will have the backbone to take the stand that you have.

Wishing you Godspeed in your work, I remain faithfully ever to assist you.

CHARLES MUNGER.

[Telegram]

SCOTTDALE, PA., February 18, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Hearty congratulations on your stand on the Mexican situation. One thousand voters, both men and women, in this vicinity applaud your stand.

J. A. KELLEY.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1927.

United States Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I be permitted to express to you my sincere approval and thanks for your stand on the Mexican situation.

We need more men like you who have the courage of their convictions.

Let us keep our hands off in other country's internal affairs. We have had enough of war. Let us live in peace with our neighbors.

I am, at your service, sir, a soldier.

Sincerely,

G. H. ALEXANDER.

MILES CITY, MONT., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you have the speech you made exposing the Knights of Columbus and their propaganda, will you please send me a big bunch of them?

I have just received 100 copies from Senator WHEELER and his speech on Nicaragua, and I have asked him for 100 more.

You have no idea how you are appreciated among the real Americans. We begin to realize what you and BORAH and WHEELER and a few others have done for America. If it had not been for you fellows putting the brakes on some of those un-American Senators, we would now be at war with Mexico and Central America. Our immigration law would have been torn to pieces and many of the measures that have been introduced that are not for the welfare of America.

We need lots of watch dogs like you fellows. The trouble is we don't appreciate you enough. But pay no attention to that; continue being Americans.

Sincerely yours,

WARNER FIELD.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Wish to congratulate you on the speeches you made and stand you took on the Mexican question.

Burn them up, Tom.

We people of Louisiana that are not Catholic are with you to a finish.

If possible to have your speeches published in pamphlet form, would like to get about a hundred copies to distribute.

Attach a clipping from the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of the 15th of February.

The New Orleans papers are too much Catholic. They won't publish anything that is against the Catholic Church. They only give your speeches a few lines and twist it up so that you would think all the Senate was against you. At the same time they publish a column and a half interview of a Catholic priest that arrived in New York who had been run out of Mexico.

Tom, we are all with you and suppose the Alabama people are also, or they have changed since I left the old State.

With best wishes,

Yours truly,

THOMAS S. TYLER.

READING, PA., February 13, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a subscriber of the Fellowship Forum and a keen observer of Roman Catholicism (political) I have noticed with much admiration your brave stand before men against one of this country's worst enemies—Jesuitical Romanism.

All honor to you.

Let me say that my brother-in-law is a Regular Army man now stationed in Texas, and a former Roman Catholic, a member now of the Lutheran Church, and I can tell you for him. He does not desire to outrage by force a weaker people and nation whose principal offense against this country seems to have been to displease a few American oil capitalists (many of whom are Roman Catholic) and the fact that she has thrown off the yoke of political Romanism. Nor do I care to see Mexico invaded by the United States. My wife was raised in a Roman Catholic institution in Philadelphia, although born a Lutheran, and her brother also went through a similar experience, and they are both very well satisfied to be dissociated with the one big church, as it is sometimes called—a system political and penurious, misnamed perhaps, but a system just the same.

If you are knifed in the back, or your life is taken in some other way, there are thousands upon thousands of real Americans who stand for flag and country first who will avenge you and carry on.

I am a taxpayer and a property owner in two cities of this great country of ours and have a family of three girls and one boy who are all able to salute the flag and say they owe allegiance to none other nor to any foreign power.

I was raised in the public schools and so will my children be raised, and if Mexico is now going in strong for public schools, I would say that alone shows well-balanced political and educational minds in back of the destinies of Mexico.

I would gladly sacrifice all I have to the cause you represent if ever the time comes when a choice must be made between America or the Pope.

I am not alone in these principles for there are millions of good Americans who feel likewise, but do not write it.

Do not worry about idle threats or taunts from a gang of thugs and cross backs for in their hearts they are all yellow. It is true there are a few exceptions.

Yours for God, home, and country,

EDWARD RIDDELL CONLEY,
Republican.

Having several good Americans at hand while I write this letter, I have asked them if they care to express to you their approval of my sentiments by their signatures below. (Nine others.)

P. S.: Most of the signatures to this letter are Republicans as I am, but Protestants first, last, and always, and if Smith of New York is defeated for the Democratic nomination by McAdoo, then three cheers for our next President for he will get as many Republican votes as President Wilson received.

The names I wish you would keep in your confidence. As for mine, I do not care, but the others could be affected more or less.

URBANA, ILL., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take great pleasure in thanking you for the stand you have taken in regard to the Mexico situation.

I again congratulate you for standing for what is right and just. If we only had more Senators like you, this country would have no fear.

May God bless you is my earnest prayer.

Ever your friend,

GEORGE W. JOHNSON.

HONCUT, BUTTE COUNTY, CALIF.,
February 5, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The consensus of opinion with Protestant Democrats in this section is, you should hold your own, HEFLIN. "Don't give it up to slaves." * * * That this Nation, the best in all creation, if it was not for HEFLIN and men such as he, would go to the devil sure. That JIM REED by change about has proved his undoing. That we have got his number now; that he is a wolf in sheep's clothing, and we have no further use for him now; that he won't be one of the immortals to reach the heavenly shore. So hold your own, HEFLIN.

JIM REED's political career is ended here forevermore. JIM REED probably thought in case he was nominated for President he might obtain Catholic votes in this section. Some Democrats here seem to think JIM is an Irishman. I asked several of them what made them think so, and they said JIM was "agin" the Government on the Mexican situation, and that every Irishman that came to our shores was "agin" the Government; and JIM's associates are Irish.

* * * JIM is in a bad fix here, and if things are in as bad shape over the rest of the country JIM never could be elected if he succeeded in getting the nomination. Why, there are Democrats here—wets—who say they would not vote for JIM if they never had another drink. I am going to write to JIM and tell him what the Democrats here think of him, and advise him instead of trying to secure the nomination for himself to use his influence to secure the nomination of some 100 per cent American. My choice for President, Senator HEFLIN; Vice President, Senator EDWARDS, of New Jersey.

Yours truly,

LE ROOY PICKERING.

P. S.: I don't belong to any fraternal organization, so no one can think there is any Ku-Klux Klan about this.

DAVIS, S. DAK., January 31, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to write you a few lines of thanks for the stand you have taken in the Mexican and Nicaraguan affair.

Our Senator, Mr. NORRICK, sent me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 13 and 14; part of your speech was in it. It says you spoke further and your remarks were in the Appendix. I did not get that part, but I know it was equally as good.

* * * (Hats off to Mr. HEFLIN.) I am glad there is at least one that will stand up for the truth. I only hope you can wake up some of the other fellows and get them to back you up. For if we don't get some action, I am afraid in the time to come we will have a government like Mexico. May the people of your State see fit to keep you in the Senate or put you in the presidential chair, and may God give you the strength and courage to stick to the truth and our Constitution.

Very sincerely yours,

E. C. DE VRIES, Box 54.

BYRON, ILL., February 5, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I note with great satisfaction your speech in the Senate. If only Illinois had one Senator who had the nerve to speak the truth as we know the facts to be. I certainly admire men of your make-up and regret only a very few take the time to write you saying how pleased they were with your speech. Yet I know millions in their own minds say, "Hurrah for HEFLIN!" I only wish we could get a candidate of your caliber for President.

While you are from Alabama, I just felt I must write and tell you how pleased I was.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. COOPER.

JONESBORO, IND., February 10, 1927.

Hon. Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND PATRIOT: I have read your last speech on the floor when you again exposed the Knights of Columbus, and I want to say it was wonderful and what we have needed for several years. Oh, if we just had more men down there with a like amount of backbone. Then to think that a dirty, fat-bellied priest would be allowed to sit in the gallery and hiss you—it makes a real American boil.

The attached clipping will show you that the man Chipps who threatened Reverend Norris was a Knight of Columbus of the dirtiest type. This is something the cowardly daily press never gave to the public. However, had he been a Mason or Knight of Pythias the fact would have been spread nation-wide.

In the Terre Haute Star Everett Watkins called you the greatest demagogue of all time and the greatest embarrassment of the Democratic Party. I say he is off his base. Mr. HEFLIN, I have been a Republican all my life and my father and grandfather were before me, but it has arrived at the place now where I say to hell with the party. I am now for the man who will do his best to save this glorious country from the clutches of the Pope, the greatest enemy of all.

If the Democrats will put up some one for President who is anti-Catholic, they can defeat Coolidge. I could never vote for him again.

Yours for more power,

H. H. PETTY.

P. S.: You were right; if they ever stab you, it will be in the back. Be careful; you know they got Lincoln, McKinley, grand Mayor Gaynor, and many others.

H. H. P.

Hon. J. THOS. HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama.

DEAR SIR: I write to say I am a Republican—get that. But by the eternal gods, I vow—swear—promise, and proclaim that if the Democratic Party will nominate you in 1928 for the presidency, I'll vote and support you and do my best to elect you—get that, too—and I voice the sentiments of millions who (like yourself) are American enough to put patriotism above party.

With best wishes, I am

Very truly yours,

O. P. MEGAHAN,
Box 435, New Castle, Pa.

FEBRUARY 5, 1927.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 10, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I, and all our grand lodge of Masons, rejoice and glory in your glorious, gallant, and truly patriotic stand you have taken on the Mexican trouble and other causes you have espoused for the greater good and justice of the American people.

The dreadful Catholic hierarchy should no longer crush and degrade poor Mexicans. Enough said is sufficient unto the day thereof. May your star rise like that of Napoleon, but never fall like his. Yours is of the soul brotherhood of Caesar, Cromwell, Gustavus Adolphus, Gambetti, Mirabeau, Garibaldi, Kosciuszko, Simon Bolivar, William Lloyd Garrison, Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Lee, Tilden, Bryan, the fearless defender of the faith of the righteous.

I venture that 6,000,000 Masons would gladly proclaim you the next President of these United States if they could.

Bless you and your work,

ROY IGO,
4421 North Racine Avenue.

EVANSVILLE, IND., February 3, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read in the daily paper of your noble defense of our beloved country in behalf of our sister Republic, Mexico, for which

I thank you. You deserve great praise and admiration. Everyone I meet is speaking in praise of you, except the Catholics, and they are not saying much.

I hope some time you will be President of these United States. Alabama is my native State, but I have been living in Indiana for 30 years.

I wish you great success and boldness in righteousness.

S. A. BALLARD,
1903 West Iowa Street.

PONTIAC, MICH., February 5, 1927.

HON. SENATOR HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As an American, a Protestant, and a believer in democracy, I wish to commend you in your defense of the truth in showing up the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic hierarchy in their effort to embroil this country in war with poor old Mexico—Mexico, that has been exploited by high finance and kept in subjection and ignorance for hundreds of years by Catholicism, the father of slavery and superstition. I would to God that we had more Senators that had the backbone to stand for the best interests of our beloved homeland. I would like to invite the Senators of our United States of America to listen to a verse of Longfellow's:

"In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of life,
Be not like dumb-driven cattle,
Be a hero in the strife."

How many Senators are playing the rôle of "hero"? How many are on the firing line to free this Nation from the influence of the Pope and his followers—the Catholic priests? Let us ask ourselves: Are we going to be like "dumb-driven" cattle (driven to the slaughter without a protest), or are we going to be a "hero" in the strife? If we are Protestants, let us protest; if we believe in democracy, let us fight its enemy (with the truth), Catholicism.

Yours for the United States of America; let her be helpful to her weak neighbors, not detrimental.

JOHN H. GARRETT,
198 Willow Avenue.

BROWNSVILLE, TEX., January 23, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I would like to shake your hand as the greatest patriot to-day in the United States Senate. I thank God for one honest man not afraid to champion the right.

War with Mexico would be the greatest sin we could engage in. We would only be defending the Pope and his cohorts in Mexico against an inoffensive, helpless people struggling for freedom, liberty, and education.

May God bless you in your efforts for your people.

Most respectfully,

J. H. DRIVER,
A retired medical doctor.

JANUARY 31, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your timely and forceful utterances on Rome's effort to get us into war with Mexico.

We are all for you in your fearless attacks on Roman Catholicism's bold efforts to Romanize the Republic. The country's deepest need is more men in Congress with your foresight and patriotism.

Success to you.

Millions of loyal patriots back you up.

Yours sincerely,
A. A. DELARM,
Pastor First Baptist Church, Omaha, Nebr.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., February 2, 1927.

United States Senator J. T. HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Is it possible for you to furnish me with a number of copies of your speech on the Mexican war situation, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 25? A friend showed me the RECORD last night and after showing that copy to the Episcopal bishop from Chattanooga, Tenn., Rev. James M. Maxon, who happens to be lecturing here, he asked to keep that copy and expects to use it in helping to drive out the present war devil that seems to possess certain people. I could use 1,000 copies of that speech if you had them to spare.

Every citizen of the United States is to be congratulated that we have to-day, in this national crisis, in the United States Senate a man of your courage and stamina, who is not afraid to speak the truth even if it strikes at the most powerful influences on earth.

Very truly yours,

PAUL F. DEHNEL.

MANAWA, WIS., January 29, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I am sending you this card in behalf of myself and a number of other citizens here; and we want to congratulate you on your speech in which you expose the underhanded work of the Knights of Columbus trying to involve this country in war with Mexico, in behalf of the Pope and the Catholic Church.

We take off our hats to you, Senator HEFLIN, and may God be with you.

Very sincerely,

HI COLWELL.

BILLINGS, MONT., January 27, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed please find a short testimonial signed by 19 representative citizens of Billings.

These few men constitute but a very small number of the local people who heartily indorse your stand on the problems of Central America.

I have been pleased to sign it and, at their request, to forward same to you.

Sincerely yours,

EARL V. CLINE,
Secretary, Ancient and Accepted Scottish
Rite of Freemasonry.

AVENEL, N. J., January 30, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This afternoon I attended a religious service, where there was a large gathering of people, and I heard your remarkable speech read, which you gave at the Senators' meeting. This was read from a newspaper clipping.

I want to take this occasion to thank you for this wonderful speech, for it shows that you are a man of grit and courage.

I am thankful that we have such a man as you for a Senator, for God knows we need you.

Respectfully yours,

MR. AND MRS. ALBERT ALBERTSEN,
MR. AND MRS. EDWARD WALTERS,
6 Fifth Avenue.

One hundred per cent Americans.

MAQUOKETA, IOWA, February 9, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: After reading the last two issues of the Fellowship Forum I can not help but think that it is my patriotic duty to commend you for the noble work that you are doing.

I believe that you have done more to uphold the principles of our forefathers, and to expose the rottenness of those who pledge allegiance to a foreign foe, than any other man that ever stood on the floors of Congress.

The threatening letters that you have received are but evidence of the tactics they will pursue in order to either rule or ruin, and is the strongest argument in favor of a deportation bill and the tightening of our immigration laws.

Keep up the good fight and rest assured of the approval of millions of loyal American citizens. I only wish that we had a man like you in the White House.

Yours in unfailing bonds,

W. W. OGDEN.

TACOMA, WASH., January 31, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: This is just a word of encouragement to you for your stand recently taken in the Mexican question.

The Protestant world ought to know by this time what the real trouble in that poor benighted country is, and certainly we as citizens of a freedom-loving United States ought to be the last to oppose them in gaining for themselves the freedom we ourselves have demanded.

Glad you made the exposure, and I am writing to say that you do not stand alone and you have the admiration of countless thousands who glory in your courage to tell the truth of the matter as you see it. Would that we had a few more men who would stand by their convictions and say the thing they know to be true.

More strength to your arm.

Fraternally yours,

REV. GEORGE F. POLLOCK, M. E. Pastor.

PORT GIBSON, MISS., February 2, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: We want you to know that we appreciate what you are doing for your country right now. We hail you as one of the bravest patriots our land has ever known for you must realize you are placing your life in jeopardy as long as you keep the stand you have taken.

We thank God for you and trust that you may be spared to see the results of your courageous attack on the greatest enemy our country has ever known.

Your very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. R. L. JAMES.

EL PASO, TEX., February 2, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to thank you for your upstanding fight in this critical hour of our country's peril.

The subsidized press gives us very little of your speeches, but enough for us to realize that in you we have one patriot who is not afraid to speak the truth.

"God give us more men" like yourself is the prayer of,

Yours sincerely,

J. C. ZIMMER,
1514 Lawton Avenue.
(Aged 90 years.)

KALAMAZOO, MICH., February 3, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please permit me to congratulate you on the stand you have taken, and your courage in telling the truth of the Mexican trouble in a way that will go down in history. There is no doubt that you will be persistently persecuted by the enemies your speech will have made, and it is my earnest wish that your spirit may be kept courageous by expressions of confidence and approval from all over the country.

We get none of the vital truths of this nature in our local paper, and it is a pleasure to find from some source that we have some men in our Senate who are awake to the dangers that threaten our governmental structure.

Sincerely yours,

L. O. MILLER,
124 Fellows Avenue.

ELDORADO, KANS., February 2, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: Out here in Kansas a great many men and women are indorsing your recent speeches before the Senate.

May God give you strength and courage to tell the American people the truth.

Very truly yours,

LULA BENTON,
Chairman Women's Council of the
Republican County Central Committee.

United States Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I take much pleasure in writing you these few words expressing my personal approval of your splendid stand and courage against the Knights of Columbus propaganda that is being broadcasted throughout this country for war with Mexico. There are many speakers that are doing their utmost to persuade the public mind their way, but thank God the Orange Order and Ku-Klux Klan—and your honorable stand of a few days ago—has enlightened the minds of the people to a point where Scott or any other lecturer can not sway them.

This is a personal letter from just a common day laborer, but I express the feelings of thousands of Maine's best citizens, millions of Protestants in this fair country of ours.

The people are following this Mexico question very closely. Your debates, also, those of Senators BORAH, LA FOLLETTE, and Congressman HUDDLESTON, are read in many lodge rooms.

I trust that you and other Representatives will carry on to the very last until truth and light will be the blessings unto all the poor Mexicans and the Word of God will be free to all.

Very sincerely yours,

ARCHIB E. SMITH.

SCHILLER PARK, ILL., February 12, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It takes a man to do a man's work. * * * The public in general had its eyes opened by your wonderful exposure in the Senate recently underlying the true motives for all the trouble in both Mexico and Nicaragua, both friendly countries, glad and willing to live at peace with us if we but mind our own business and keep on our side of the fence.

The great rank and file of Americans do not understand fully what is at the bottom of all the trouble with Mexico, namely, the Catholic Church, and more particularly its priesthood, with its pernicious interference in governmental matters, and so the Knights of Columbus are willing to spend millions to embroil this country in war with a friendly national that Uncle Sam might pull the Pope's chestnuts out of the fire.

Real Americans appreciate and are thankful that men like you, Senator HEFLIN, stand on guard to keep the country informed; a man that is brave enough to come right out in the open and put your finger on the sore spot and call it by its right name. I am speaking only for myself but you can rest assured that your gallant action will be cherished and rewarded by millions of real Americans even if they do not write you or congratulate you in person. True, you are not making a lone stand in this matter as you have a number of able comrades in both House and Senate, but nevertheless I wish to thank you.

There is nothing wrong in the people having a perfect right to petition Members of Congress, but it is criminal for any sect or society to try, through propaganda, to throw a country into war through lying and deceit.

Respectfully yours,

O. E. LOEK.

REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.,
February 10, 1927.

United States Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

HON. MR. HEFLIN: The Redondo Beach Men's Club, in meeting assembled on last Wednesday evening, February 9, unanimously approved the wonderful stand you have taken on the floor of the Senate on the Mexican question and the spirit of true Americanism shown in your attitude.

Peoples possessed with the spirit of 100 per cent Americanism can and should appreciate the worth of men like you, who dare to stand for the right.

God give us men.

Yours sincerely,

C. C. CRIBBS, Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 6, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I extend to you my sincerest congratulations for the stand you have taken on the Mexico and Catholic situation.

It is comforting to know there are still a few red-blooded Americans in our beloved Capitol with backbone enough to stand up for what our forefathers fought for.

It is too bad that the majority of the Protestant population has acquired the sleeping sickness.

Keep up the good work. I am,

Yours very truly,

A. L. SUGGETT, 1469 Carmen Avenue.

EVANSTON, ILL., February 7, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Please accept my heartiest congratulations for the frank and honorable stand you have taken on Americanism.

There is no alternative for a real American.

You are not alone in your convictions and it would please me to know that our honorable Senator from Illinois would see the light and help shoulder the fight with you.

Again extending my congratulations, and best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

A. A. BERNAHL.

BUFFALO, N. Y., February 14, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You and I are on different sides of the fence politically, but I want to thank you most heartily for your stand on the Mexican matter. It is time some one spoke up in meeting and had the courage of his convictions. There is absolutely no doubt that

the Knights of Columbus would gladly push us into a war for the sake of their damnable superstition. P. S., mis-called "religion."

Of course, in this priest-ridden city we have seen nothing of what you said, except a short report, which probably got through by accident, and which doubtless makes for a bad time for the offender.

If a man is arrested in this city for some trivial offense, the newspapers will headline "Klansman accused of crime," and in the body of the article will say "The accused is believed to belong to the Ku-Klux Klan." But a Romanist is accused of murder, convicted, and appeals. The papers refer to him as "the accused cleric."

I have made this suggestion to several Knights of Columbus: "If you want to clean up Mexico," their phrase, "why not send down your gallant knights, with their cocked hats and tin swords, and show them what you are worth?" Not them!

It is said your life is threatened. Threatened men live long, and those fellows are too wise to try anything of the sort. It would stir things up—the last thing they want.

With best wishes.

Very truly yours,

F. E. WILLIAMS.

LEOMINSTER, MASS., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Words can not express the high admiration I have for you in regard to the Mexican situation. Anyone who isn't afraid to get up and tell the truth, no matter how much opposition, certainly deserves commendation.

I only wish we had more men like you at the head of our great country. I have many friends and relatives here that have voiced their opinions, and they feel exactly as I do about it.

Please keep up your good work. Surely God will be with you, and you will win in the end.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD E. POWERS,
18 Bowen Place.

AMBOY, MINN., February 14, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this to show that some of us appreciate the stand you have taken in the Mexican situation. Although the papists and Knights of Columbus may be making a lot of noise, the real Americans are behind you.

There are 6 votes at our house. Should you ever aspire for something more than Senator you can count on us. And lots of friends and neighbors think the same as we do.

May God bless you and all your interests. May He also give more men at Washington the courage to stand up for the best interests of the good old United States of America.

I remain,

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH C. DETHLOFF.

TOPEKA, KANS., February 14, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: I want to congratulate you on your recent speeches in the Senate.

I understand thoroughly just how much courage it took to make those speeches. I understand this because I have watched eagerly in the press and also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find some such stand by our own Kansas statesmen, and found nothing.

It was a matter which required courage to discuss frankly and sincerely from all angles.

Your speech was pretty well covered by the Fellowship Forum, and your stand will be approved and appreciated by loyal American citizens all over the country.

Thanking you for your stand and splendid courage in this matter, I am

Yours most sincerely,

LILA DAY MONROE,
Editor Kansas Woman's Journal.

ROSELLE PARK, N. J., February 6, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank God for men like you. Let us hope others will soon follow in your footsteps and not be afraid to speak the truth.

For every hiss of the Roman Catholic priest, remember you have the blessings and prayers of a million Protestant Americans. You have started the good work. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JENNIE A. CHRISTIAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., February 7, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on your stand for Americanism.

Thank God that at least one State will elect a man who is not afraid to tell the truth.

More power to Alabama and to her Senator, J. THOMAS HEFLIN.

Respectfully yours,

W. L. MCCONOMY,
1417 Jerome Street.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., February 7, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great concern several accounts of the religious issue and debate on the Mexican policy between you and Senator COPELAND.

And I wish to say I agree with you on every point on this subject. The Knights of Columbus are the most egotistical, flamboyant, untrue, and destructive organization we have on our shores of America to-day. And they are working day and night to put their "Faithful" Al Smith up for nomination for President in the coming election.

I take great pleasure in writing you that I admire you as a "two-fisted, red-blooded, full-fledged, fighting American," and you make a good example for other Senators to follow. And the good people back home in Alabama, your State, can feel proud and look upon you with much pride in presenting you with this office of high honor, as you are now engaged in the most serious fight of your life of which you are and will be successful.

Wishing you all the success and good health there is in this world and that some day the White House may be your home.

Yours very respectfully,

HOWARD E. GREY,
146 Washington Avenue.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., January 29, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senator from Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please be advised that your stand on the present Mexican situation, as reported in our local press of to-day, has struck a responsive chord of approval at this distant point.

The undersigned feel that it is about time that some of our representatives who are fortunate enough to possess a degree of what may be called "abdominal fortitude" in lieu of the more popular expression, to publicly declare some of the real facts in connection with this situation.

We offer this, therefore, as our expression of approval, encouragement, and moral support.

Respectfully submitted.

FIRE DEPARTMENT,
I. B. TRUESDEL,
First Assistant Chief.
B. M. BLAKE,
Second Assistant Chief.
F. SHIRLEY,
Executive Clerk.

SIDNEY, NEBR., February 12, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Only wishing I could pat you on the back for your stand in the Mexican situation. I just want to tell you that Nebraska stands all most solid with you.

You surely have the moral support of the Nebraska Protestant people.

Yours very truly,

J. M. NELSON.

SANTA CLARA, CUBA, February 12, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BROTHER: I note that you have done your plain simple duty when such work was needed. I thank you for it. I was required to close my Methodist school, The Peoples Institute last February, in Piedras Negras, Mexico, and have had some opportunity to study Romanism in Mexico, the United States, and now in Cuba. I hope you will keep clear of the foolish notion that Romanism is better in the United States than in Catholic countries. I think it is more impudent there than anywhere.

What I started out to say is this: I can give you the law of the Catholic Church, up to date, authoritative, imperative to the effect that it is a mortal sin generally for a Catholic to vote for any man who defends liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, liberty of the

press, and that it is the duty of all good Catholics to extirpate any newspaper that defends liberty of worship, liberty of conscience, or liberty of the press. I can show you where it is a fundamental law of the Catholic Church to lie and commit perjury in the interests of the church, and where the Catholic Church has the right to authorize the killing of a contumacious heretic.

When a Catholic Senator objected to your accusations by stating that he voted as he pleased he did not touch sides nor bottom of the issue. The Catholic scheme makes deliberate provisions for granting freedom to any prominent member, so that he may not be called to account by his priest; that does not touch the question as to the authority of the priests over their members. I can give the published law on that. You will find my name in the report I gave in the Fellowship Forum some three weeks ago as to Mexico.

I shall be glad to hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,

J. A. PHILLIPS,
Pastor, Santa Clara Charge, Cuban Conference,
Methodist Episcopal Church South.

CLARENDON HILLS, ILL., February 14, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I wish in this manner to congratulate you on the splendid speech which you made on the Mexican situation on January 21, 1927, and to assure you that all good American citizens appreciate that we have men of your type in the Congress of this great United States of America.

A man who can unflinchingly stand before the assemblage of our Representatives in Congress and let the truth be spoken is to my mind the type that is needed in our country to-day.

You can well be assured that you are merely reviving the spirit of the Father of our Country, George Washington, whom we will soon honor the birth anniversary of, and it is indeed fitting at this time to pause and try to perpetuate the visions of the character and loyalty of the first President of the United States of America.

The Monroe doctrine can be applied also to selfish individuals who will barter our freedom for political reasons in the guise of a sacred religion.

May God bless you in your stand in that which history has proven is the foundation of our peaceable liberty.

Yours sincerely,

P. T. LINDEN.

MIAMI, ARIZ., February 5, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Arizona, wish to extend our congratulations and hearty indorsement of your stand in the Senate relative to controversy between our Government and the Government of Mexico.

You certainly expressed our ideas and beliefs in the matter.

Yours very truly,

C. O. GLOVER
(And 19 others).

HAVERHILL, MASS., February 15, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To congratulate you upon your fearless and courageous stand that you have taken toward Americanism would indeed be a mild form of appreciation.

Your enduring courage, and your excellent ability to voice that courage, will go far toward saving America for Americans.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. D.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., February 13, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is with grateful appreciation that I read in the January 29 issue of the Fellowship Forum your speech before the Senate in regard to the war propaganda put forth by the Roman Catholic organization with respect to the Mexican question.

The searchlight of truth, which was so turned on the darkest of manipulations and human policies, brings to the slowly awakening American mind the necessity of more light. That you should be flooded with threats is only natural, and that you may be assured of support, so far as you walk in the light of principle, from every righteous thinker I want to contribute my word of encouragement.

Remember that the keynote of the last beatitude is "rejoice" in persecution, and Jesus's words "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death," is an answer to every threat against your life, and your endeavors toward a righteous government will be fruitful.

Very respectfully,

EDITH F. FONTAINE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., February 2, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: In these trying times when one like yourself is frequently maligned and misrepresented by the foes of liberty and friends of Rome, I wish to simply state that although not a resident of your State (I am from New York) I want to say that I have heard you speak in the Senate Chamber, and while sitting there I could not help but admire the manner in which you stood up for the truth. You have, I assure you, many, many admirers throughout the land who, with myself, would consider it a distinct honor to be able to cast a ballot for you should opportunity ever present itself so to do.

Yours truly,

H. ROBERT FETTEROLL,
Box 126, Summit Avenue, New Drop, Staten Island, N. Y.

LANCASTER, S. C., February 1, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Unity A. R. P. Sabbath School, congratulate you on the stand you have taken against the undermined organization that have been plotting to hurl our country into war. We thank God that there is one man in the Senate who is not afraid to stand, seemingly alone, and tell the truth; but you have the people at your back.

May success and honor be yours in the great fight that you have launched for peace.

We admire your courage; keep up the fight.

Very sincerely,

J. D. and SHIRLEY B. NISBET, Committee.

TRENTON, MISS., January 29, 1927.

Hon. TOM HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Would you mind sending me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carrying your remarks made recently touching the Catholic question?

I am with you and glad Alabama has a man in Congress who has the courage of his convictions.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Very respectfully yours,

J. C. BELL.

P. S.: If Al Smith is put on Democratic ticket I won't vote it, though it has been the political faith of my ancestors as far as I have any record.

J. C. B.

LINDEN, N. J.

Hon. T. R. HEFLIN, Senator.

DEAR SIR: We note with pleasure your courageous stand in the Senate for pure Americanism, pure Protestantism, and for God, country, and free public schools, unhampered by the Knights of Columbus or Rome, from any angle.

Keep up the good work.

God always provides a man in time of need.

Very truly yours,

MR. and MRS. B. B. PHILLIPS,
115 Elizabeth Avenue.

FEBRUARY 1, 1927.

Mr. HEFLIN.

DEAR SENATOR: At our last regular meeting, held January 20, 1927, we the members of the Ossining Circle Club wish to commend you upon the action which you took in regards to the Mexican situation.

Yours in loyalty,

GEORGE G. WALKER,
179 Grove Street, Mount Kisco, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 11, 1927.

Senator THOMAS J. HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HEFLIN: For your private information, I want you to know that your voice has been the voice of practically all of the citizens of Alabama, as well as of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the entire United States, as you have so courageously protested in the Senate against the efforts of Romanists and certain internationally minded capitalists to plunge our Nation into war with Mexico. And I want to congratulate you on the courage and intelligence and forcefulness of your utterances and on the stabilizing effects of those utterances upon our foreign relations.

As I have on scores of occasions recently spoken regarding the Mexican crisis and the causes therefor, and have referred extensively to your commanding leadership in the Senate as affecting this situation, I have had unusual opportunity of noting the reaction of the masses of our voting populace. From the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee

line and from our Mississippi border to the Georgia boundary—everywhere in Alabama—our people are proud of you and indorse your stand.

Keep up the good fight; your labors are not in vain. Millions upon millions of Americans are fervently saying "Amen" to your words, and thank God that the voice of patriotism is not silent in the Senate of the United States.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

Birmingham, Ala.

NEW YORK CITY, February 1, 1927.

United States Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Good for you!

In your speeches in the Senate exposing the efforts of the Knights of Columbus you have rendered a signal service to your country.

Here in New York City the Roman Catholics have got a strangle hold on the city government.

They oppose the public school, their priests saying that the teaching of children that is not supervised by priests and nuns is the devil's work; yet Romanists control education and have 75 per cent of the positions as teachers.

There are no end of big firms in this city where the heads of departments, heads of personnel, secretaries of the heads of the concerns are Roman Catholics, and they make it their business to see that the best jobs are given to members of their own faith.

A man who is married and employed in one of these places is afraid to say a word in defense of Protestantism. And to think that the Declaration of Independence was signed by but one Catholic!

I am told that the superintendent of the Woolworth Building has boasted that every one of the hundreds of employees is a Roman Catholic. One of the daughters of Woolworth married a Roman Catholic.

Speaking of Mexico, over station WHAP, in this city, last Saturday night, the secretary of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States stated that in one day in the Alameda—what is now the public park of Mexico City—139 men and women were burned alive by order of the inquisition, Dominican fathers being responsible for this terrible deed.

The Knights of Columbus are putting forward preposterous claims in regard to the immigration quota of the Irish Free State. A letter in the New York Herald-Tribune of last Sunday, giving figures and dates, says that Great Britain—not the Irish Free State—is discriminated against, as the greater portion of the Irish in the United States in 1790 were from the north of Ireland and Protestant.

John Carroll, bishop of Baltimore in 1789, estimated the entire Catholic population of the United States at 30,000, of whom 3,000 were colored. Many of the 30,000 were of French and German origin.

Keep up the good work, Senator. You have behind you a tremendous following.

AN ADMIRER.

P. S.: I know Freemasons in this city who are afraid to say that they belong to the Masonic Order. The Roman Catholics are so strong and so resentful here.

TACOMA, WASH., February 8, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you and extend to you my appreciation for the stand that you have taken in the Senate regarding the Mexican situation. You are doing our country unmeasurable good work.

Sincerely yours,

GAIL M. KENNEDY,
124½ East Sixty-ninth Street, Seattle, Wash.

MILLSBORO, PA., February 13, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with much pleasure of your firm and decisive stand in matters pertaining to our relations with Mexico and the insidious activities of the Roman Catholic Church and its affiliated organizations in their endeavor to embroil the United States in war with Mexico.

I can truthfully say with thousands of others that "we thank God that there are yet a few men who help control the affairs of our Government who have the vision of right, justice, and love of country sufficiently strong in their hearts; that we can yet live in peace and not hear the cannon's opening roar of conflict."

Dear Senator, we thank you for your service to "our country," and may God ever give you the strength to fight on.

Very truly yours,

J. A. HARSHMAN.

LEXINGTON, N. C., February 11, 1927.

Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have noted with sympathetic interest the sane and sensible stand you have taken in regard to our conduct in China and Central America, and we want you to know that we are with you to the last man. We are unable to see how any sane, patriotic American can find fault with your diagnosis of the situation.

We love our country. We give it first place on every program, and we never forget the men who dare to take the stand you have taken. If there is at any time anything we can do to strengthen your arm, let us know.

We are,

Faithfully yours,

LEXINGTON KLAN, No. 25, REALM OF NORTH CAROLINA.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 1, 1927.

Hon. Senator HEFLIN,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is with sincere admiration that I congratulate you for the stand that you have taken in the protection of the interests of the American people, not only of your own State but of the one great Nation of which we Americans feel so proud.

It has come to the time when the interests of the Americans must be protected from the degrading element that is fast becoming a menace to our welfare and the urgent need of men like you to stand up and demand that the rights of the American people be protected from an un-American, apparently uncivilized class of degenerates that are trying to run the affairs of this country.

Wishing you a success in your undertaking.

Very truly yours,

L. E. GRIBBENS.

ROANOKE, VA., February 2, 1927.

Senator THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You probably remember addressing a Bible class here a few years ago at their banquet, which was held at the Elks' Club. I happened to be a member of this class and there is where I met you.

I want to state with all earnestness that I appreciate the stand you have taken and the courage you are showing regarding Mexico. Let some of the officials there and some of the people here or anywhere else make a joke of what you say. I want you to know, and know you do know, that millions of people, and among them the very best, are right back of you. If weak-kneed politicians and the Catholic press does not get us in trouble in some way sooner or later, I am fooled. I think it is great to have a man in your position that is not afraid to say "Catholic" or "Knights of Columbus" when it is necessary.

I live in America, the part of it we call the United States, the greatest country on earth, and I am proud to be its honored citizen, and I am looking to such men as you, down there in Washington, to see to it that this country continues to be well worthy for the abiding place for the best people on earth. If I wanted to serve the Pope, Mussolini might furnish space and a few onions in Italy for me.

Please pardon me for intruding, however. I just wanted you to know I am by your side.

Yours very truly,

W. T. BRODIE.

MOUNT GREENWOOD, ILL., February 2, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN.

SIR: For the first time last night I heard a part of your speech read and have been unable so far to get to read it all, but that part which I have heard is all there and then some, and I certainly admire any one that has enough backbone to get up and tell what you have and you certainly can feel sure that you have a couple of people that are backing you up to the limit and will continue to do so as long as the writer is living.

I only wish that I were better educated and could get out and express my views as I see them. I would do so on every occasion possible.

Stick to what you have started, and you certainly will get the backing.

Sincerely yours,

IRVIN HOEPER.

SIDNEY, NEBR., January 31, 1927.

Senator HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have noticed through the public press your remarks in the Senate relative to the Nicaragua and Mexican situations. I want to commend you for your courage in this matter in which you have placed the blame on a lot of this trouble just exactly where it belongs. I have always been a Republican, so that my writing you is not a matter of politics; but to let you know that I agree with you that a spade might as well be called a spade and blame placed exactly where it originated.

It may be a matter of encouragement to you to know that there are hundreds and probably thousands in the State of Nebraska that will commend your action.

Yours very truly,

W. K. HODGKIN, *Lawyer.*

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 29, 1927.

HON. J. T. HEFLIN,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I express my appreciation of the courageous stand you have taken in the Senate debates on Mexico?

We have been following your speeches and those of the Senators in opposition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We think that your leadership has aroused public opinion to such an extent that the administration would not care to wage war in behalf of a minority in face of such determined opposition of the numerical majority.

Yours sincerely,

MISS IRENE E. WILLIAMS,
109 Clearview Avenue, Crafton Heights.

422-424 ASHLAND BLOCK,
Chicago, Ill., February 1, 1927.

HON. JAMES T. HEFLIN,
*United States Senator, Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is to tender you my vote and voice of approval of your fearless attitude and utterances on the Mexican question.

Voting right is, of course, something, but there is no substitute for the courage to voice openly the reasons for one's vote as you have done. This is where you have rendered an outstanding service to this Anglo-Saxon Protestant Nation of ours. In calling a spade a spade, you have publicly slammed the red hot branding iron of Americanism on the hide of this Hibernian bloc, and all of us should keep it up until the flesh sizzles to the tune of the Red, White, and Blue. The squeals from these seared sons of the "Howly Father" is somewhat of a contrast to the usual blatant litany of villification, requiems of vituperation, and pontifical profanity, indicating that your shots registered hits.

With best wishes, I am
Yours truly,

WM. J. MOORE,
Attorney at Law.

JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Senator HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It gives me great pleasure in sending to you this American message.

Your stand on the ideal that this great country has made its wonderful progress in justice to all, brought about by religious liberty to all, and your stand to lift up the weak and to assist the weak, as we have grown strong in it. May God help you in the success in reaching out your hand to Mexico in its weakness, and by your act will strengthen it in the same rights and religious liberty that we enjoy.

Yours very truly,

J. LAVULLEN BARRY,
211 Clinton Avenue.

EDGEWOOD, R. I.

DEAR SENATOR: Please let an "unknown" compliment you upon your stand in the Mexican situation.

I am a lifelong Republican in National politics, but my hat is off to you as any man who dares to tell the Catholic Church where it gets off when mixing up in politics.

I am not a bigot against Catholicism, but I can never stand to see any church (and I am a church member) hold control over the United States Government, as the Pope would do if Al Smith were President, as the Knights of Columbus could embroil us with Mexico or Nicaragua.

I admire any man who has a faith in God and the only thing I have against a Roman Catholic in high office is, that with all Catholics, church comes first, State second.

Keep it up!

Yours sincerely,

S. A. WINING,
136 Wheeler Avenue.

GRAND JUNCTION, MICH., February 1, 1927.

HON. J. THOS. HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I want to say a word of encouragement to you for the wonderful courage you have shown in standing by American principles.

Oh, how I wish Michigan had a man of your type in the Senate.

I am a Republican, but if you were running for office in or from this State I surely would split my ticket. I do hope you fellows will force arbitration of this Mexican question. I can see no other way. We were very anxious to arbitrate a similar question with Japan. You remember that California land-holding question of the Japanese.

Now, Mr. HEFLIN, do not get discouraged; there are millions of good people with you. You are considered one of our very best soldiers.

From your very good friend,

ALFRED SIMONS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, February 1, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: It is with great pleasure and interest that I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily. I have been much interested in the statements you make in the Senate, and in behalf of our organization I am watching closely the stand taken by various Senators on American affairs with Mexico and Nicaragua.

After reading your statements printed in the issue of January 25, I can not refrain from congratulating you upon your Americanism and the fearless repudiation you make to the tactics used by our Roman Catholic friends. America needs men like you to defend her from the uncanny serpent-like fangs of the Roman Catholic dictators and those who would ignorantly do their bidding. I wish to reiterate my congratulations and say that I know several thousand women in Ohio join me in this expression.

With all good wishes, I am,

Most sincerely,

RITA SHAFFER,
*State Secretary of Ohio,
Women of the Ku-Klux Klan.*

BROOKINGS, S. DAK., January 31, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Protestant America is very proud of you and very grateful to you for the stand you have taken on the religious question, or rather the papal sedition program in Mexico.

It is quite a novelty to read of a man with the courage to stand on his own feet and state facts as they are and not what a certain faction would like to have us think they are.

Your name is mentioned with great respect in this State, which is not so far from the Canadian border and I want you to know that you have lots of friends and admirers in this section of the United States of America.

Papal interference, in the world in general and America in particular, is not only a detriment but a curse, and men who have the courage to denounce this meddling are few. On the other hand, there are too many seeking papal patronage.

A Protestant who does so, sells his birthright for a mess of "Spaghetti" and no more sickening sight exists than a Protestant fawning at the feet of an un-American priest, who owes allegiance to the "warped mind of the tiber."

If I ever have a chance to give you a vote in any way, it is yours from a 100 per center.

ORVILLE McCOUN.

WESTON, MASS., February 12, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
*United States Senator from Alabama,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have watched you with great interest and wish to congratulate you on the wonderful stand you have taken.

I am a citizen behind you.

Sincerely yours,

FRED V. RICHARDS,
Concord Road.

DETROIT, MICH., February 21, 1927.

Senator J. THOS. HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to bring to you my thanks and congratulations on your attitude on the Mexican situation.

Of course, the religious question is always injected by that quasi-religious-political organization which perpetually tries to run church and state affairs. I am glad you have the courage to throw it in their faces in the Senate. This immoral, law-defying, and Constitution-nullifying, pagan outfit needs exposure of its subtle and insidious efforts to involve the United States Army and Navy to kill liberty in that parochial, benighted country.

I inclose a clip from our Hearst Detroit Times of August 23, 1926, in which the bishop speaks his threat of what 800,000 Knights of Columbus will do to Coolidge.

Also a clip from the Detroit News of January 31, 1926, an editorial from the New York World, which shows the "oil" part of the question

to be almost eliminated, but that Doheny is still involved and with him, you can see; he has also involved the question of using the administration against the law and administration of Mexico. I have thought it possible you had not seen this World editorial, which seems brief and conclusive. More power to you. Keep it going.

Respectfully,

T. P. SCHOOLEY, Attorney,
34 Partage Avenue.

JACKSON, LA., February 12, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SENATOR: Your speech in regard to the Romanist trying to involve us in war with Mexico is the best and most convincing we have ever read.

It is a pity that there are not more who have the courage to stand up for pure Americanism. And just why so many Protestants fear the Pope's army of underlings it is astonishing to us.

We have all wanted to write to you (about 200), but will not take up your valuable time to read same.

Keep up the good work, and when Congress is adjourned open a speaking bureau and tell some of these "benighted hindoes" the truth. With all kinds of good luck to you.

JACKSON KLAN, No. 25,
Jackson, La.

RALEIGH, N. C., January 28, 1927.

Senator J. THOS. HEFLIN,
Senator of United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: By order of the Klan in Klunklave assembled, I, R. A. Wadsworth, kligrapp of Raleigh Klan No. 1, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, am instructed to write you the appreciation of the Klan of your stand in the Senate of the United States with reference to the Mexican situation.

No Klansman, and, as for that, no true American citizen, can but be proud of the courage that enabled you to speak with such candor and with such convincing force, the true patriotism and love for our country that was breathed into your every sentence and the directness with which you called to account those who would put other allegiance above that which every citizen owes to the Stars and Stripes.

We have no quarrel with those who differ with us, but we are at everlasting enmity with all and all who would lay profane hands upon our institutions, set at naught our Constitution, destroy our traditions, or make meaningless our hard-won heritage.

We desire that you know of our thanks to you, our pride in your manhood, our belief in your cause, and our determination to stand with you until the victory is won.

Very truly yours, in the sacred unfailling bond,

R. A. WADSWORTH,
Kligrapp, Raleigh Klan No. 1, Realm of North Carolina.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., NO. 10 MANSUR BLOCK,
CORNER ALABAMA AND WASHINGTON STREETS,
January 21, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: We, the women of Hoosier Capitol Klan, No. 12, Indianapolis, Ind., wish to extend to you our congratulations on the wonderful message you delivered before the Senate on January 18, and wish to take this means of letting you know we are with you in the sentiments expressed and are very grateful for a Member of the United States Senate who has the strength of his convictions and is not afraid to voice them.

Sincerely,

HOOSIER CAPITOL KLAN, No. 12,
Indianapolis, Ind.
LILLIAN G. SEDWICK,
Excellent Commander.
MARAH SHAFFER,
Secretary.

NELIGH, NEBR., January 21, 1927.

Hon. J. THOS. HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of our organization last night the matter of the Mexican question came up, and many of the members expressed their approval of the position you have taken in the matter, and we desire to express our appreciation of your stand which represents our views. We wish you success in making others see it as you do. We are strong for you.

Yours for business,

ANTELOPE COUNTY, NEBR., KU-KLUX KLAN,
Lock Box 237, Neligh, Nebr.

P. S.—Have you any data at your disposal that we are not able to get from the public press that would be of value to us? If you have, we would highly appreciate such a favor.

J. A. M.

WATERBURY, CONN., January 24, 1927.

Hon. TOM HEFLIN,
United States Senator from Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We congratulate you on your outspoken exposure of the Knights of Columbus propaganda in regard to Mexico.

We thank the Lord that there are still some real Americans who have the undiluted patriotism to tell the unbiased truth, even when it is condemning of our internal enemies.

May God protect you and yours, and give you strength to carry on the great fight for our American ideals.

Yours for Americanism,

WATERBURY KLAN, No. 14.

ENNIS, TEX., February 12, 1927.

Hon. J. THOS. HEFLIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HEFLIN: We, the membership of Ennis Klan No. 79, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, Realm of Texas, take this method of commending you and Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, on your stand taken last month, openly, on the Nicaragua and Mexico controversies. And extend to you our unceasing support; that you stay right up there on the firing line—that does not spill nearly so much human blood—for the cause of our country, our homes, and humanity.

We hope that many more from both the House of Representatives and Senate will join you and Senator WHEELER in giving this matter of war with Nicaragua and Mexico a death blow every time it comes before you.

The majority away down here in this good old Southland understand this old propaganda. And every honest-to-goodness American citizen knows that war with either of these countries, over their internal affairs, would be all loss, and no gain.

Yours for the cause of our Nation and humanity.

J. K. DONNELL,
F. V. LAUDERDALE,
H. F. VERNER,
Committee.

"Whereas there has been a considerable amount of propaganda spread over the United States for the purpose of creating a sentiment in favor of war with Mexico; and

"Whereas we believe that this propaganda originated in the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, and that the sole purpose of creating a war with Mexico is to regain for the church those civil powers taken from them under the present administration in Mexico; and

"Whereas our Senators and Representatives have heretofore apparently feared to speak the truth regarding this matter for fear of persecution: Now, therefore, let it be

"Resolved, That inasmuch as Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, of Alabama, has had the courage and integrity to live up to his oath of office in defending our Nation against the treacherous plottings of its enemies, we hereby express our hearty approval and appreciation to Senator HEFLIN for his brave stand; and be it further

"Resolved, That we forward a copy of this resolution to Senator HEFLIN as an evidence of the good will and gratitude of several thousand Klansmen of Kalamazoo County, State of Michigan."

Adopted in regular klunklave assembled this 11th day of February, 1927.

KALAMAZOO KLAN, No. 126, REALM OF MICHIGAN,
By ITS SECRETARY.

HICKORY, N. C., February 7, 1927.

Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on some speeches I read in the Fellowship Forum you have made in the United States Senate in regard to this Catholic and Knights of Columbus organization.

If we don't stand up for Americanism this country is gone. For the sake of the rising generation please vote for any measure that stops foreigners from coming to our shores, and to deport any who are here and do not naturalize and live like Americans.

Yours as a "one hundred per cent,"

J. S. SEABOCK,
621 Chestnut Avenue.

KNIGHTS OF THE KU-KLUX KLAN,
Aberdeen, S. Dak., February 11, 1927.

HON. J. THOMAS HEFLIN,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to say that your stand upon the Mexican question is bringing favorable comment from all the real Americans out this way.

My work for this order is in the same line as that disclosed by your record of public service. Therefore, in the name of a common cause, for the safety of our country and civilization, may you be strengthened to lay on.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. JEFFREY,
Imperial Representative for
North and South Dakota, Utah, Idaho, and Nevada.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, of course I have no idea of making any general reply to the Senator from Alabama. To do so I should have to transport myself backward at least to the fifteenth or sixteenth century. Nor do I propose to comment on anything that he said with reference to me personally. That passes by me like the idle wind, which I regard not.

But I do wish to say just a word with regard to the Baltimore Sun, because the Sun in the State of Maryland is not simply a newspaper organ—it is an institution. It was founded in the first half of the last century. It is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. It has been a source of enlightenment, of instruction, and of pleasure to the people of Maryland ever since that time. There are some of us who could just as well get along without the sun that rises above the horizon every morning as without the Sun that is laid upon our doorsteps every morning. Its editorial columns have always been conducted in keeping with the very highest standards of disinterestedness and ability. Its news columns have always been singularly free from smut and scandal—indeed, from everything that is capable of contaminating a newspaper. It is a source of pleasure to us to feel that not only is this great newspaper held in the highest esteem by the people of Maryland, but that it is held in the highest esteem by thousands of individuals beyond its borders.

Several years ago Mr. Charles R. Crane, one of our recent ministers to China, passed through Baltimore, with which he had never had any familiarity. He said to me:

Mr. BRUCE, will you not do me the kindness to take me down to the editorial rooms of the Baltimore Sun and introduce me to the managers and members of the editorial staff of that newspaper? I read a considerable number of newspapers, American and foreign. As you know, I have been very much of a traveler in the course of my life. There are few parts of the world with which I am not more or less conversant, and I do not hesitate to say that the Baltimore Sun is not only one of the best newspapers in the United States, but one of the best newspapers in the world.

It so happens that there was a time when the Baltimore Sun was owned and controlled by Catholics, a fact which no reasonable mind would unduly stress. It then spoke the language of religious tolerance and political enlightenment, which I flatter myself is the ordinary language of the State which I have the honor to represent in part in this body. Now it happens to be owned and controlled by Protestants, and it still speaks the language of religious tolerance and political enlightenment, because since the very first establishment of the Commonwealth of Maryland that has been the prevailing language of its people. Religious tolerance is our noblest tradition. It is the most lustrous jewel in the crown of our good fame. I am delighted to say that I live in a State where it is not only considered unpatriotic but very bad manners for any man to give expression to sectarian prejudices.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. If I were to speak in slighting terms, in the social circles in which I move, of a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, or a Catholic, my friends and acquaintances would begin to raise their eyebrows and shrug their shoulders and ask, "What sort of ill-mannered fellow is this?"

I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Senator believe that I was guilty of religious intolerance when I rose on the floor of the Senate and read and discussed the resolution of the Knights of Columbus, in which they denounced our Government's position and demanded that the policy cease, and that we should pledge support to the Roman Catholic Knights of Columbus in Mexico, and proposing to raise a million dollars to carry on their propaganda against the Government's position? Did I do wrong in doing that?

Mr. BRUCE. I think it is not unlikely that the Senator did not realize the full significance of his bigoted language. He

belongs to that class of which Jesus said, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." But I do say—

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Maryland has not answered my question.

Mr. BRUCE. The whole tenor of his remarks is to renew the bitter feeling—

Mr. HEFLIN. Did I do right in bringing that matter here and discussing it?

Mr. BRUCE. You did wrong.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is what I thought the Senator would say.

Mr. BRUCE. Because you attached an extravagant degree of significance to those things that you should not have attached to them.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad that the Senator has let Maryland know that he feels that way in advance.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I do not happen to be a member of the Catholic Church. I am a member of the church that, perhaps, is the next thing to it—the Protestant Episcopal Church, though in boyhood I was reared in the Presbyterian Church; and if it will give an opportunity to the Senator from Alabama for further vituperation, I will say to him that I have more than once knelt at a Catholic altar; that I have even had a Catholic priest lay his hand upon my head when invoking the blessings of heaven upon me, and that I felt the better for it.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Maryland was once a Presbyterian, he has strayed a long way from home. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUCE. No; not at all. The Senator from Alabama does not know the spirit of our people. A few days ago a public-school functionary in one of the counties of Maryland dismissed a young girl from her position, and it was strongly suspected that she was dismissed because she was a Catholic. Perhaps she was dismissed because the breast of her superior had become fired with wretched bigotry by some of the utterances of the Senator from Alabama. The very first man to raise his voice in unqualified denunciation of the act was a Protestant clergyman.

Ah, the Senator little knows how many letters I, too, have received since he has been indulging in these tirades against the Catholic Church, and how many of them have proceeded from Protestants, including Protestant clergymen, deeply deploring the fact that such invectives could be spoken by anybody upon the floor of the Senate as those that have been spoken by the Senator from Alabama.

No; we do not want any return to the Know-Nothing period in the history of this country. All of us are familiar enough with that period when a wave of religious prejudice swept over this country, and was finally stayed, I am glad to say, in my native State, Virginia, by the eloquence of Gov. Henry A. Wise, a Protestant. That movement, which was born mainly of rowdiness and ruffianism soon ran its course; and so I believe will every similar movement.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. BRUCE. Another thing. If for no other reason, it does seem to me that the Senator from Alabama, as a matter of common party gratitude, ought to still his tongue, if it is possible for him to still it. I am afraid it never will be stilled until he has worn it down to the tonsils. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. If I should wear my tongue down to my tonsils, it will be in the cause of my country and not in the interest of the power that the Senator from Maryland is serving.

Mr. BRUCE. Has the Senator from Alabama forgotten that perhaps 50 or 60 per cent of the entire membership of the Democratic Party of this country north of the Potomac River is Catholic? Has he forgotten that in the dark hours of reconstruction, when nothing less than a culture was eating into the very vitals of the South, it was those Irish Catholics who were the first to come to our rescue and to begin the great movement, that with the subsequent assistance of the liberal Republicans, ended in our disenthralment?

Mr. HEFLIN. Before the Senator gets away from the Know-Nothing period, I should like to ask him another question.

Mr. BRUCE. I rejoiced the other day as a southerner, though I hesitated to speak in a sectional vein, because I despise sectionalism and love my whole country—every part of it—when I had an opportunity to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that beautiful and eloquent tribute paid by George Gordon Battle, not a native of the State of Virginia, as the Senator from Alabama said on yesterday, but of North Carolina—to the Catholic element in the South.

As I have said on a previous occasion, that element is associated with all that is best in the history, the traditions, and the spirit of the South. During the Civil War it gave of its blood to the cause of secession as freely as any other element

in the South. One of the most beautiful poems in which a sacred memory has ever been embalmed was that written by Father Ryan, an Alabama priest, entitled "The Sword of Robert E. Lee."

Some of the remarkable men in the political history of the South, as George Gordon Battle points out, were Catholics. A few years ago, when that noble and venerable institution of which I am proud to be an alumnus, the University of Virginia, founded by the leading apostle of human freedom, Thomas Jefferson, held its great anniversary, attended by a vast concourse of distinguished men and women, made up of visitors from every part of the world, its authorities looked over the face of the South to select the servant of God that would, in their opinion, be best fitted to open the exercises of the occasion, and whom did they select but Archbishop O'Conne, the Catholic prelate of the city of Richmond, Va.! That was the true South, not the spurious South that seeks to revive religious bigotry and to stir up fraternal hatred.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, before the Senator gets away from the subject, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. BRUCE. When I began, I really had no idea that I was going to say as much as I have said.

Mr. HEFLIN. I should like to have the Senator discuss the Catholic inquisition and the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

Mr. BRUCE. The Catholic inquisition! Surely the Senator is put to dire extremities when he has to go back for centuries.

Mr. KING. Why not discuss witchcraft in Massachusetts?

Mr. HEFLIN. I should like to have the Senator discuss those subjects.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; as suggested by the Senator from Utah, I might as well discuss witchcraft in the State of Massachusetts during the colonial period or superstitions in other parts of the United States that flourished for a time, shriveled up in the light of advancing civilization, and passed away. Nothing is to be gained by such talk as that in which the Senator from Alabama has indulged. It simply tends to set brother against brother and to curdle the more generous and kindlier feelings of human nature and to falsify the very best expectations of the framers of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one other question. I should like to ask the Senator if he had been the only Senator to discover the resolution passed by the Knights of Columbus at Philadelphia suggesting this war propaganda, would he have brought it to the attention of the Senate and the country?

Mr. BRUCE. In any period of excitement there are always extremists who give expression to ideas and feelings that do not meet with the approval of the mass of human beings whom they purport to represent. I have not the slightest doubt that some indiscreet and hasty things were said by Catholics throughout this country at the time when the Mexican situation was the most tense; but suppose the millions of men and women in Mexico had not been Catholics but had been Methodists or Presbyterians, do you suppose for a moment that the hearts of their coreligionists in the United States would not have been stirred to their profoundest depths and that among those coreligionists at times some voice or voices would not have been raised in immoderate terms of protest? All Senators will recollect that some years ago the Boxer disorders broke out in China. At that time it was not so much Catholics whose lives or safety were endangered as it was Protestants. Naturally enough, from the coreligionists in the United States of those people arose a most earnest demand upon the Government that it should take steps, and prompt steps, for the purpose of safeguarding Americans in China.

But, Mr. President, I have said entirely too much. Sometimes one of the greatest mistakes that we can make is to speak too fully in reply to something which has been said and which does not deserve a full reply. In my humble judgment—and I say it with respect to the Senator from Alabama—he has, since his attention has been turned to Catholicism, placed himself entirely beyond the pale of responsible statesmanship, to say the least, and my only hope is that in the course of a few days he will pass through a due process of contrition and succeed in bringing himself back to the point where his feet were first diverted into the paths of error.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. DILL, and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. PHIPPS. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing—

Mr. HEFLIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield for the purpose of having a call for a quorum?

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not. Mr. President, it seems to me evident that a quorum is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I am attempting to make an inquiry of the Senator from Washington in regard to procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point can not be made when a Senator has the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. But if a quorum is not present and a point of order is made, the Senate can not proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is always presumed to be present.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington if he is willing to lay aside the unfinished business in order that we may make a little progress with the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia?

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I recognize the position of the Senator from Colorado, and I am sympathetic with him, but the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has been sitting here all morning with the hope of getting the floor to talk for 10 or 15 minutes upon the conference report on the radio bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have no desire to hold up the appropriation bill.

Mr. DILL. The point is this: The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] is ready to speak, as well as the Senator from New York, and I hesitate to lay the bill aside at this moment, but a little later, if I can do so, I will give the Senator an opportunity for the consideration of the appropriation bill. I would not, however, wish to make the request now.

Mr. PHIPPS. May I ask the Senator if it would not be agreeable to have the Senator from New York speak and then take up the appropriation bill? I am fearful that if a number of Senators discuss the radio bill, I shall have to ask that the Senate remain in continuous session to-night until we pass the appropriation bill.

Mr. DILL. I am with the Senator in that suggestion.

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not think that should be necessary. I do not want to inconvenience Senators, but I have been very patient with this measure, and if it is agreeable to the Senator that we may consider the appropriation bill after the Senator from New York shall have concluded his remarks, I shall be entirely satisfied.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I will ask the Senator from Washington, however, to bear in mind the fact that I am strongly opposed in no less than three different respects to the action of the committee that is handling the appropriation bill. I think that the committee has not done justice to the people of my State, and I expect to take the time to tell the Senate why I think that. So, if the Senator lays aside this bill in the expectation that the bill in which the Senator from Colorado is interested will be very speedily disposed of, he is mistaken. I do not expect to speak at any great length, however, and certainly I have no disposition in the world to filibuster against the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. PHIPPS. I will.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I call to his attention the fact that the discussion to-day, as of yesterday, with the exception of the address of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], has not related to any subject matter directly before the Senate.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In all probability the debate would have proceeded just as it has proceeded if the District appropriation bill or any other measure than the radio bill had been before the Senate; so I do not think, in justice to the Senator from Washington, that he should be asked to lay aside the radio bill upon any theory that a filibuster is in progress against the radio bill, or that the general business of the Senate would have been facilitated if there had been nominally before the Senate another measure than the radio bill. I make that suggestion to him in fairness, as I believe, to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. PHIPPS. I have the Senator's answer. I will wait for a later opportunity.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I only want to consume about four minutes in reply to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I feel some responsibility to keep the radio conference report before the Senate. The Senator from Alabama has already spoken twice on this conference report at great length; and I shall feel constrained to apply the rule in this matter in the interest of the expedition of public business.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have not spoken on it at all.

Mr. DILL. The Senator has spoken in the time of the conference report.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not to-day. The rule reads, "on any day when the matter is up."

Mr. DILL. The Senate recessed last night.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator is not willing for me to have four minutes, I promise him that I shall speak at length, and he will not pass the bill to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Alabama? The Senator from Alabama did consume the entire day yesterday, and he has consumed the larger part of the day to-day, in the discussion of a matter that is not directly before the Senate. In fairness to the Senator from Washington, who has a bill before the Senate, he ought to be permitted to consume a little time in the discussion of the measure that the Senate has before it without being subject to the threat which the Senator from Alabama has made.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am willing for him to do that, and I asked him for four minutes in which to make just a brief reply to the attack upon me by the Senator from Maryland in the closing part of his remarks. If the Senator from Washington does not want to grant me that time I know what my rights are as a Senator, and I am not speaking for myself alone. I am speaking for ninety-odd millions of American people in my speeches.

Mr. DILL. We recessed yesterday evening and I make the point of order that the Senator has spoken twice on this bill, once during the calendar day of yesterday and once to-day. If the Senator threatens things here, I do not propose to be intimidated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the point of order is well taken, unless by unanimous consent the Senator from Alabama is given time to proceed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I ask unanimous consent to speak for four minutes.

Mr. MOSES. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] has gone on record as opposing my efforts to prevent war with Mexico at the instance—

Mr. PHIPPS. I call for the regular order.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Alabama should take his seat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The Senator will take his seat.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 9971) for the regulation of radio communications, and for other purposes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to say before making any remarks on the radio bill that I feel embarrassed. I should be very glad, indeed, to waive any rights that I have to the floor if we could go on with the appropriation bill; but the Senator in charge of the radio bill insists that we go forward with it, so I will proceed.

After all the exciting incidents of the afternoon, I fear, too, that any discussion in a plain way of this particular bill will seem dull and colorless. However, it is before us and must be given consideration.

I want to say, first, Mr. President, that there is no doubt in my mind of the necessity of some sort of constructive action regarding the matter of radio control. I am receiving an endless number of letters and telegrams from constituents of mine who are unhappy over the present situation. To show that I have no desire whatever to defeat radio legislation, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I have presented a joint resolution which, in my judgment, would cover the transition period between to-day and the time when we can pass effective legislation. This joint resolution is very brief. It reads:

Resolved, etc., That, first, the Secretary of Commerce be, and he hereby is, directed to issue no licenses to operate any broadcasting stations not in operation at this time.

Second. That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he hereby is, empowered and directed to prohibit any and all existing and licensed radio broadcasting stations from in any manner changing or modifying any wave lengths or using any other than those originally assigned to them by the Secretary of Commerce.

Third. That the foregoing provisions be in force and effect until such time as Congress may permanently legislate upon the foregoing subject.

As I see it, the passage of this resolution would provide a legal way of controlling the air and the radio problem until there could be some permanent and more effective legislation. My thought about it is that this conference report should be defeated; but, if it is, that something in the way of this particular joint resolution must be enacted in order that the present chaotic conditions may not continue or grow worse.

I desire to commend the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]. I think the Senate owes him a great debt. He has gone forward patiently and diligently in an effort to pass through this body a conference report which I venture to say, although I have no authority for saying so, probably he does not approve in his heart. But he is anxious to facilitate the passage of radio legislation.

This is not a good bill. This conference report does not safeguard the rights of our country as regards radio control. Every speaker who has risen to talk at all on the subject has apologized for the conference report. Nobody has undertaken to say that it is a perfect bill; and, as I see it, it is a very dangerous measure.

Have you stopped to think, Mr. President, what this great radio enterprise is? To begin with, it is the most wonderful invention, I suppose, of this wonderful generation; and more and more, as time goes on, the American people will be dependent upon it for the dissemination of information and for entertainment.

Mr. President, I can not blame Senators for being restless, but I assure them that I take no more pleasure in presenting this matter than Senators do in listening. I have a sort of conviction that if one feels as I do about this measure he ought to say publicly what he thinks about it, and I shall attempt to say what I have to say in the briefest manner. I have no doubt that the capacity of men to listen is somewhat controlled by the barometric conditions. The barometric conditions to-day are such that nobody wants to listen to anything, and they are certainly such, so far as I am concerned, that I do not want to say anything.

We have before us, however, a measure which in my judgment is so defective that it may defeat future control of the ether. If there is any such suspicion in the mind of any Senator, as I view it, he has no business to vote for the conference report.

Let me call your attention to several matters. They have been ably presented, far more ably presented by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] than I can present them; but, still, I desire to recall them once more to your attention.

In the first place, the conference report fails to include any affirmation of ownership of the ether, or any declaration of policy on the part of the United States to exercise jurisdiction over the ether. It is too bad that this is the case. I think it was the House bill that had the affirmation of ownership, where this language was used:

It is hereby declared and reaffirmed that the ether within the limits of the United States, its territories and possessions, is the inalienable possession of the people thereof.

In the Senate bill it is provided that—

The Congress hereby declares, asserts, and reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to exercise jurisdiction over all forms of interstate and foreign transmission of energy, communications, or signals by radio within the United States, its territories, and possessions; that the Federal Government intends forever to preserve and maintain the channels of radio transmission as perpetual mediums under the control and for the people of the United States.

These are positive statements on the part of the House in the bill passed there, and on the part of the Senate in a bill which was passed by this body under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL].

As I see it, we should not put ourselves in the position of giving an opportunity to users of the ether to claim vested rights. We should here and now affirm, reaffirm, and declare our ownership of the ether in order that we may make certain that in the future one who uses it without permission of some body or individual granted power by the Congress shall not have a right vested.

As I see it, this conference report is defective from its very beginning. There should be no action by the Congress which omits such an affirmation or declaration as I have suggested.

Taking up the bill—and when I speak of the bill I refer, of course, to the conference report as presented to us by the conference committee—the language is as follows:

No station license shall be granted by the commission or the Secretary of Commerce until the applicant therefor shall have signed a waiver of any claim to the use of any particular frequency or wave length or of the ether as against the regulatory power of the United States because of the previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise.

That afforded protection to the people of the United States forever against anyone claiming a right superior to the right of the Government to regulate.

Let me call attention to page 2, lines 17 and 18, where the report seeks to control—

the transmission or reception of such energy, communications, or signals from and/or to places beyond the borders of the United States.

In connection with that I turn to page 13, line 15, where it is stated that—

no license so granted for any other class of station shall be for a longer term than five years.

The licenses which are proposed to be granted under this conference report are of two types. One is a simple broadcasting license, where the license is given for three years, and then there is one which has to do with the control of energy, communications, or signals, where it is proposed to give a license for five years.

I am very suspicious about that provision. There are well-defined rumors that radio science has progressed to the point where there is every reason to believe that heat, light, and power will be influenced by further invention. I do not think I would be satisfied to permit the giving of a license for a period of five years where there was a possibility that tremendous development having to do with the common welfare may go on to the extent of actually supplying our people with heat, light, and power. I am not a prophet, or the son of a prophet, but who would venture to say, in the light of the progress which has been made in the scientific world in the last few years, that we may not, through the development of this science, find applications of it, in other directions, that will make for the happiness and comfort and welfare of the people in the future? If there were no other reason for declaring our ownership of the ether, reaffirming our right in it, making as sure as may be that licenses now granted may not become vested rights, that very possibility would determine me to be in opposition to this bill.

To go further, this conference report provides for the creation of a commission. I would like to ask the American people if they want another commission. If there is one thing that I am convinced of it is that the American people are sick and tired of commissions. They do not want any more commissions. Yet this conference report provides for a commission which will function very actively for a period of one year, and then have some very uncertain and indefinite functions forever afterwards.

That leads me to say that in section 5 it is proposed after the first year to turn over certain functions, practically all the functions, to the Secretary of Commerce. Why not do that in the beginning, if we are to do it at all?

Let me call the attention of the Senate to what has been developed so well by the able Senator from Nevada, that this commission has the right to regulate the kind of apparatus to be used, and all through it is the suggestion that the commission, and even the licensee, has the power to change the sort of apparatus which shall be used.

A week or so ago I asked the Senator from Washington, in charge of the bill, if he had the feeling that the licensee might, under certain conditions, require the use of a specific sort of apparatus, and the reply was that he did think so. I remember that at that time the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] said it would be absurd to have any such change made in the required apparatus, because immediately the users of the radio receivers would turn to some other station.

I suggest that the power of advertising is remarkable, and the owner or licensee of a radio station has tremendous power to advertise, to spread the knowledge that a certain form of entertainment is to be given, that a certain great artist is to broadcast, or that a certain series of illuminating addresses are to be given by a certain broadcasting station, but that in order to pick it up a different style of apparatus must be used. I am sure that no Member of the Senate is willing to have a situation created which may make possible the im-

position upon the people of this country the necessary for the purchase of thousands and perhaps millions of dollars worth of new apparatus.

I assume that the Vice President, now presiding over the Senate, is a radio fan. I do not know anybody nowadays who is not one. If the Vice President's experience has been like mine, he is now using about his fifth or sixth radio set. I think I am now using my fifth. Changes have taken place, improvements have been made, and, of course, more improvements will be made, and those we welcome, but if the time comes when anybody can say to those who desire to use radio-reception machines that they must have a certain type in order to get the benefit of broadcasting, then we will have developed a situation which certainly will be intolerable, and I doubt if it would meet the approval of the citizens of this country.

On page 19, at the top of the page, where it speaks about the relation of the commission with the licensee, it speaks of what may be done if the licensee fails to provide reasonable facilities for the transmission of radio communications, where a licensee has made any unjust or unreasonable charge, or has been guilty of any discrimination.

I think the Senator from Washington will admit that this language, and other language in the bill, indicates that a charge may be made, and if a charge may be made there is no manner of doubt that a charge will be made, and pretty soon those who desire to make use of their radio outfits will find that in order to do so they must pay a fee.

I want to ask this: What is there to prevent a combination of licensees in a district requiring new apparatus or some special device? I think it is reasonable to expect that that may happen.

There is further evidence to the same effect found on page 22 of the bill, line 13, where it speaks of receiving for hire energy, communications, or signals by radio. I have had innumerable letters and telegrams, as I have already said, but no one of the persons sending me messages of that sort has had knowledge that this particular legislation, if put into effect, may impose upon the particular listener in the necessity of paying money in order that he may hear. We can not afford to disregard these things. We have no right to impose upon the citizens of the country such a defective control of the ether as to make possible the calamitous things I have mentioned.

On page 20 of the bill, at the top of the page, we have a hint of the various lawsuits which are probable, which at least are contemplated by the bill, where reference is made to the necessity of appealing to the Federal Trade Commission and, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] pointed out, to the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain conditions. Why invite these lawsuits? When we have enacted effective radio legislation there will be provision made, as it was made in the splendid bill written by the Senator from Washington and the Interstate Commerce Committee, that the rights which those licensees may have now will be waived in order that their licenses may be continued.

I call attention to page 22, beginning in line 20, where it is said:

Or shall acquire, own, or control any part of the stock or other capital share of any interest in the physical property or other assets of any such cable, wire, telegraph, telephone line, or system.

What does that mean? Why should not the radio licensee have a right to acquire wires and to make use of them? We can not chain or hitch up a series of broadcasting stations unless we have wires to use. If this feature was not born in the brains of the directors of the telephone and telegraph companies of the country, I am badly mistaken. Of course, they do not want any wires to be owned by the broadcasting stations. If there is any profitable business in the world outside of the automobile business, it must be in the profits which have come to the telegraph and telephone companies by reason of the advertising through the radio of contests of one sort and another. An automobile is to be the prize, and where the first person to guess the population of Nevada on the 25th of December of a certain year would be given an automobile. This is the present method of putting money in the coffers of the telegraph companies.

Mr. President, I hold in my hands the hearings of the Committee on Patents on the bill by which it was proposed to amend the copyright act relating to the broadcasting of music. The statement was made there by the chairman of the administrative committee of the American Society of Composers that as a result of messages sent out through the radio 167,000 telegrams were sent to Members of Congress, representing fees to the telegraph companies of \$90,000 for that one purpose.

Of course, the telegraph and telephone companies of the country do not want any competition in the transmission of messages of that sort, and so it is written into the proposed law that the broadcasters must not own and operate independent wires.

These are some of the things which have occurred to me in connection with the conference report. I desire to call particular attention to section 40, on page 36, the last page of the conference report.

This act shall take effect and be in force upon its passage and approval, except that for and during a period of 60 days after such approval no holder of a license, etc.

In other words, the licensees are given 60 days in which to close up their affairs and get new licenses. It is perfectly absurd to think that in 60 days or six months or a year this matter could be properly arranged for.

Just now, as I understand it, there is a great lawsuit pending between the independent wireless organizations and the Radio Corporation of America about the use of tubes. If the Radio Corporation's contention should be upheld, it would create a monopoly. There should be no conclusive end of the matter until we have time to work out a plan and an effective plan. Certainly to think about being able in 60 days to control the whole great business is an absurdity beyond expression.

I saw a statement made by one of my congressional colleagues, Congressman BLOOM, of New York, in which he said that the radio business is more profitable and brings in more money than is represented by the receipts for sales of all the organs and pianos, all the sheet music, all the harps, horns, violins, banjos, talking machines, saxophones, and drums, so it must be a very profitable business. It is going to be more and more profitable, and we are going to be more and more dependent upon the radio. The newspapers of the country have a great problem to face in the development of the radio. There are other rights to be considered than those of the radio broadcasters.

We can not afford, as I see it, Mr. President, to take definite action now. I should be satisfied to have the matter go back to the able Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] and the Interstate Commerce Committee, because we know from experience how fine a bill they brought out last year.

I venture to believe that no member of the committee feels in his heart that the conference report presents a proper bill, and, of course, it does not. Let us not be put in the position of passing now upon the greatest invention or discovery of the ages. We can not afford in the final days of the session to pass such a bill without making a very careful study of it and of its significance to the country. It is too serious and too important a matter to be done in that short time. Let us either refer back to the committee the conference report, or else let us reject it entirely, pledging ourselves at the same time to pass some such measure as the resolution which I have presented, in order that we may make sure that no new licenses shall be granted, in order that we may make sure that no rights are vested more than they have been, in order that we may protect the millions of users of radio sets in the country, in order that we may protect our newspapers, in order that we may protect the public against a hasty and inconsiderate action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I beg that the Senate will not take favorable action upon the conference report, but will wait for a more acceptable time to pass a finished and more nearly perfect measure.

Mr. HOWELL obtained the floor.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. Can the Senator give me any information as to what length of time he will probably occupy?

Mr. HOWELL. I doubt if I will occupy more than half or three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. PHIPPS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Caraway	Edwards	Gooding
Bingham	Copeland	Ernst	Harris
Blease	Couzens	Ferris	Harrison
Bratton	Curtis	Fess	Hawes
Broussard	Dale	Frazier	Heflin
Bruce	Deneen	George	Howell
Cameron	Dill	Gillett	Johnson
Capper	Edge	Glass	Jones, Wash.

Keyes
King
La Follette
Lenroot
McKellar
McMaster
McNary
Mayfield
Means
Metcalf

Moses
Neely
Oddie
Overman
Phipps
Pittman
Ransdell
Reed, Pa.
Robinson, Ark.
Robinson, Ind.

Sackett
Schall
Sheppard
Shipstead
Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Smoot
Steck
Stewart

Trammell
Tyson
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mass.
Warren
Watson
Willis

Mr. McMASTER. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is unavoidably absent from the Senate owing to an injury received in an automobile accident.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who are absent from the Chamber, are attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the pending measure, if enacted into law, will determine the principle that will govern respecting the right to use the ether for communication by signals, voice, or radio vision when perfected; the broadcasting of music; and the possible transmission of energy for the development of mechanical power. It will also prescribe rules regulating such use of the ether. And, finally, it will designate the authority or authorities upon whom will devolve the duties of administration and regulation.

Each of these objects is highly important, but of widely varying degrees of importance. The character and powers of the commission and officials that are to administer the proposed law are necessarily a matter of no little moment to station owners and those seeking the privilege of establishing new transmitting stations.

To radio listeners the "clearance of the air" seems the important feature of this legislation, but to the Nation at large the importance of all other objects of the pending measure is overshadowed by this question: Who is to own the right to use the ether—all of the people or just a few of the people who have been fortunate enough to acquire radio transmitting stations?

In short, matter contained in the proposed legislation, which may be altered or repealed by Congress at any time, is of minor moment, but that which may irretrievably affect the people's proprietary interest in the ether is of tremendous importance.

Whether the administration of this remarkable development shall be under one official, or under a commission composed of several individuals, is a matter that may be determined now and altered by Congress at any time. Again, so far as regulatory rules are concerned, they may be enacted to-day and amended or repealed to-morrow. But, Mr. President, if the theory of vested rights to the use of the ether is once accepted by Congress, even though by mere implication, and the same theory, in effect, is upheld by the courts, as it probably would be, this principle will be established, to wit, that the mere use of the ether may constitute a property right. If this should result, such property of the ultimate value of hundreds of millions of dollars will be found in possession of a few only, while the many—generations unborn—may in the future be compelled to pay dividends, without end, upon the value of such property. Thus will be developed the possibilities of a far-reaching monopoly, and we know only too well that such possibilities sooner or later are likely to end in monopoly.

The pending bill, as it comes from the conferees, is in consonance with the theory of such vested rights—a theory that has been subtly inculcated in the public mind not only by the great radio interests in the United States but elsewhere in the world.

The attitude of these interests is essentially human and appeals to the property instincts of many, especially those who consciously and unconsciously indorse, as in accord with the eternal fitness of things, that—

unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

The radio interests contend: "Having established a station and operated it in accord with legally established regulations, we, of course, naturally have the right to continue to operate such station in perpetuity, and also to sell and transfer the station and license at any time we see fit." Acting upon this theory as an accepted fact, radio interests have been buying and selling radio stations, together with their licenses, upon the basis of values far in excess of that of the mere apparatus.

Moreover, in recognizing these sales by transferring the licenses involved, the Department of Commerce has practically approved the theory of vested rights, and in nearly every case the purchasers, instead of filing applications and taking their turn with scores of others, have been, by transfer, afforded licenses immediately. Why? Because evidently they have been deemed to have purchased something. And that "something," they are now urging, was not merely an apparatus, but additional property in the form of a right to use the ether therewith.

As a concrete example, if at any time during the past two or three years I had applied, in due form, for a radio license, I might have waited in vain for its issuance because of the number of unsatisfied applicants ahead of me. However, months after the filing of my application, my neighbor might have purchased a station and its license, in which case Secretary Hoover would have allowed the latter's transfer. Thus my neighbor might have begun broadcasting at once, although the idea of doing so might not have occurred to him for months after the filing of my application.

In this manner stations and licenses have been transferred in consideration of the payment of large sums of money. The highest price thus far recorded was in the case of station WEAJ (New York), the consideration in connection with the transfer being \$1,000,000.

In view of these facts, can we doubt the confidence of the big radio interests in the ultimate approval of the theory of vested rights to the use of the ether? And remember these great interests are solidly behind this bill as it comes from conference.

The evidence of this is the innumerable telegrams that have been flooding the Senate for days urging the immediate passage of this measure. During the past week or 10 days great broadcasting stations, dotting the country from the Pacific to the Atlantic, have been urging their listeners—who necessarily know little about the pending legislation—to wire their Senators for immediate action.

The following is a quotation from the Omaha World-Herald of February 11:

HOWELL ASSAILED FOR ATTITUDE ON RADIO CURE BILL—LISTENERS DEMAND SENATOR CHASE OBSTRUCTION TO RELIEF PLAN—FLOOD OF MESSAGES FROM OVER THE LAND

Speaking over WOW station Thursday night, Hal Edwards, president of the Omaha Radio Trade Association, after asking voters to besiege Senator HOWELL with telegrams asking for the passage of the bill, declared that the Senator, in his opinion, is offering only evasions in declaring his position in opposition to the bill. * * *

Telegrams from cities all over the United States poured into Omaha yesterday urging action to force HOWELL to make a change in his attitude toward the radio bill, Edwards stated. Among them was the following from the St. Louis Radio Trade Association:

"Senator HOWELL, of Nebraska, is consistently blocking every attempt to bring the radio bill to a vote. Will you have all radio interests in Omaha wire him immediately that he is standing in the light of industry? Ask him to let the bill be voted on by Senate at once. Delay means no radio law and continued broadcasting chaos."

Edwards was bitter in commenting on Senator HOWELL's action in his speech over WOW. "He has entirely forgotten that he is in the Senate to carry out the wishes of the voters of the State," Edwards stated. "The whole country is watching the situation with interest and expecting Nebraska radio listeners to deliver HOWELL's vote for the bill on Friday."

This was supplemented by the following:

STRONG RAPS HOWELL—SAYS NEBRASKAN TRYING TO "HORN IN" ON SENATE RADIO BILL

CHICAGO, ILL., February 10.—Efforts of certain Senators to delay action on the proposed radio measure, already passed by the House, are condemned as "political" by Walter Strong, chairman of the radio coordinating committee which has been active in pushing this measure. He scored Senator HOWELL (Republican, Nebraska) as "trying to horn in on the Senate's radio program."

I think there is not a Senator here who will charge that whatever protest has been made respecting this radio conference report has been based upon political reasons.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am rather amazed at the statement made that the protest should be charged to political motives. I am quite curious to know what the writer or the speaker means by "political." It is well known that those who have been opposing this conference report—and I am among the number—have done so because they believed that it tended to perpetuate a monopoly, or, if a monopoly did not now exist upon this

great factor for intelligence and civilization and the spread of knowledge, that this bill as it comes from the conferees would tend to increase the power of a potential monopoly.

My objection to the conference bill—and I am sure it is the objection of all who are opposing the conference report—is based almost entirely upon the ground that we see in the conference bill a monopoly that will prove injurious to the American people; and when that speaker or writer denominates the opposition as founded upon political considerations, he states what is obviously an untruth. That, however, is the way of the monopolists. Any objection to monopoly—and we have monopolies here that are threatening the very industrial and economic and political life of the Republic—is met by the allegation that it is a political consideration rather than an economic one; and, as suggested sotto voce by a distinguished Senator, those who oppose measures monopolistic in character are denominated socialists.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for his courage in opposing this conference report; and I am sure that the people of Nebraska, when they learn the facts, will indorse his course.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, this is, indeed, evidence of the intolerance for which radio may be made the vehicle. I early took a deep interest in the development of radio and especially its broadcasting features. In 1921 I served as chairman of the radio service commission of the Post Office and Agriculture Departments, and as a member of the first radio conference called by Secretary Hoover. Naturally my interest has continued during my service in this body.

At the time of the passage of the pending radio bill during the last session I felt that its provisions protected the interests of the public so far as the alienation of the use of the ether was concerned, and, as there was little opposition to the measure, I did not occupy the time of the Senate with remarks prior to its passage. However, when this bill was received by this body from the conferees with provisions practically eliminated that had been inserted to the end of preventing the acquisition of vested rights to the use of the ether, I did take the floor in protest; and though altogether I have occupied a total of but 48 minutes of the Senate's time thus far in connection with this conference report, I have been subjected to intolerant attacks from broadcasting stations in the West, conveying the impression that I have been filibustering against the pending measure.

Mr. President, it is time for Senators to stop, look, and listen respecting the possibilities of radio attacks and the impossibilities of adequate reply.

Some two years ago I introduced in the Senate a resolution asking for an investigation by radio technicians employed by the Government to determine what it would cost to have the proceedings of the Senate broadcast, so that the public should not receive second-hand information of what takes place on this floor. I proposed that the Army stations throughout the country should be utilized for this purpose, because they must be maintained, are adequately equipped, and the personnel is there for service. Several days after I introduced the resolution I was called upon by representatives of the telegraph and telephone company and asked why I proposed the Army should perform this service.

My answer was that I believed it could do it more cheaply than otherwise. They thereupon furnished me a copy of a letter that had been forwarded to the committee of the Senate having under consideration my resolution, in which the company offered to broadcast across the country the proceedings of Congress without any charge whatever.

In order that Senators may be treated fairly, we shall have to come to something of this kind. Otherwise we will be at the mercy of broadcasting stations, because the conferees have eliminated the provisions introduced in the Senate bill providing for a measure of protection under such circumstances.

Mr. President, in section 4, on page 50 of the Senate bill, we have this language:

SEC. 4. All matter broadcast by any radio station for which service, money, or any other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid, or promised to or charged or accepted by, the station so broadcasting, from any person, firm, company, or corporation, shall, at the time the same is so broadcast, be announced as paid for or furnished, as the case may be, by such person, firm, company, or corporation.

If any licensee shall permit a broadcasting station to be used as aforesaid, or by a candidate or candidates for any public office, or for the discussion of any question affecting the public, he shall make no discrimination as to the use of such broadcasting station, and with respect to said matters the licensee shall be deemed a common carrier in interstate commerce: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power to censor the material broadcast.

Mr. President, that was the section as passed by the Senate; but what have the conferees done? They have eliminated it from the present bill, and substituted the following:

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOWELL. I do.

Mr. KING. The statement just made by the Senator obviously is of great interest; and I was wondering what explanation was made by the conferees, or by any member of the conference committee, of the elimination of that provision. There must be some reason for it. Otherwise, it would seem to place their seal of approval upon the power being vested in those who have these licenses to discriminate, and to use their power to the advantage of those who have wealth as against those who may not have the means of purchasing the right to broadcast their intellectual matter, their speeches, or otherwise.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, which reported this bill to the Senate; and I know that the conferees were fully in accord with the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. KING. The Senator means the Senate conferees?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes; the Senate conferees and they are still in favor of these provisions; but I am informed that at least two of the House conferees insist that if these provisions are reinserted the bill will be killed.

Now, Mr. President, I will read the corresponding section in the report of the conferees:

Sec. 18. If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, and the licensing authority shall make rules and regulations to carry this provision into effect.

Mr. President, it will be noted that under the provisions of this latter section if a candidate is allowed to use a station, other candidates for the same office must be allowed the same privilege, however, if a representative of a candidate is allowed to use a station, there is no provision that the representatives of other candidates must likewise be allowed to broadcast. Moreover as to public questions, censoring discrimination generally and declaring the licensee to be a common carrier, this substitute section is silent.

Mr. President, in framing this section, the Senate committee had in mind reported experiences during the last campaign. In one case a distinguished Member of this body, who had been invited to speak to his constituency by radio, was asked to submit his manuscript for censoring. It is needless to say he not only refused but canceled his engagement. In another previous instance the Westinghouse station in Hastings, Nebr., after extending an invitation to a public official to speak, re-required him to submit his manuscript, and all contained therein in criticism of "Pittsburgh-plus" was perforce deleted.

We are building up in this country a tremendous, irresponsible, publicity power, unregulated, of which Members of Congress and many other public officials may find themselves not only early victims, but practically without redress.

It is well known that you can not convict a proprietor of a newspaper for printing a criminal libel even in the form of an open letter followed by his name as the signature of the writer unless you are able to prove that he actually signed such letter—a practically impossible thing in any well-regulated newspaper office. Evidently it is much easier and safer to commit such a crime by radio, because unless it so happens that the libelous statement is reported verbatim by some listening stenographer it will be almost impossible to prove the criminal character thereof, to say nothing of satisfying a jury as to who was speaking at the time of its utterance. These considerations were weighed by the Senate committee and a provision inserted in the bill requiring every radio station affording programs to keep an accurate official log of its broadcasting. Naturally the big radio interests are opposed to anything of such character, calculated, as it is, to render more certain the responsibility of a station operator and anyone speaking into the microphone. As a consequence, though the bill passed the Senate providing for the keeping of logs and imposing the added responsibility of a common carrier, these provisions have been stricken out by the conferees with the consent of the Senate Members; and why? Because we are informed that the ultimatum of the House Members is that the bill must go through in its present identical form or else it will be killed, and, moreover, there shall be no radio legislation at this session of Congress. Considering the character of these changes, is not this attitude of challenging significance?

However, Mr. President, these are details to which I have previously referred as changeable by Congress at any time, hence of minor importance. The great, tremendous question is that of the proprietorship of the ether. In comparison with this all other questions dealt with sink into insignificance, as Congress is at liberty to settle them one way or the other now, and quite in some other manner at any future time. Such, however, is not the case so far as the proprietorship of the ether is concerned. What Congress does now in this connection may result in property rights which Congress can not hereafter revoke or alter.

From a property point of view there are two theories respecting the ether and its use. The first theory is that supported by the great radio interests and which leads to vested rights. Under this theory anyone who has been in consecutive use of the ether for a period of time is deemed to have acquired a right to such use in perpetuity, subject, of course, to the regulatory power of Congress, and hence may sell and dispose of such right as in the case of other property. The second theory holds that whoever uses the ether acquires no rights except those enjoyed by a tenant at will. In short, that no one shall ever acquire, in perpetuity, any rights to the ether or its use.

The Senate committee, opposed to the theory of vested rights, has fought for this second theory. We have believed it unthinkable that anyone should ever gain a right to use the ether in perpetuity and, as a consequence, the bill as it went to the conferees, after passing the Senate, was in consonance with the tenant-at-will theory. However, before I develop this fact, by reference to the text of the Senate bill, let us consider some previous history.

In 1924, during the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, I introduced a radio bill, which I quote in part as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ether and the use thereof for the transmission of signals, words, energy, and other purposes, within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States is hereby reaffirmed to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States and their Government, but privileges to enjoy such use may be granted as provided by law for terms of not to exceed two years.

All such licenses heretofore granted by authority of Congress shall terminate within two years (if not sooner under the terms thereof) from the date of the approval hereof, and no such license shall be renewed, or any additional license granted, except upon the filing with the Secretary of Commerce of an application by such licensee or applicant, executed under oath, setting forth, in the form prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, that the claims of such licensee or applicant to the use of the ether are in consonance with and limited to the recitations and provisions of this act.

As is evident, the purpose of this bill was to establish a policy to the effect that the ether and the use thereof should forever be the property of all of the people and not ultimately become the possession of but a few of the people. Moreover, it was so framed that if anyone using the ether dissented from this view, it would be necessary to recant by signing a waiver, as provided, or resort to a mandamus and thus litigate his claims to vested rights at once and not years—possibly a generation—hence.

This bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce and passed by the Senate. However, when this measure reached the House, it was opposed by some of the present House conferees, and all after the enacting clause stricken out, causing, of course, the bill to fail. Notwithstanding, however, there was inserted in the pending bill as it passed the Senate, early last year, similar language as follows:

And no license shall be granted until the applicant either for a license or for a renewal of a license has signed under oath a waiver of any claim of right to any wave length or to the use of the ether because of any previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise.

In short, the Senate reaffirmed its adherence to the tenant-at-will theory respecting the use of the ether.

The House disagreeing in some respects with the bill as passed by the Senate, the present conferees were appointed, but to no immediate avail, as the conference was unable to reach common ground before adjournment. As a consequence, for the protection of the public interest, during the period between the sessions of Congress, a stop-gap, reaffirming the tenant-at-will theory, was adopted by both Senate and House in the form of a joint resolution reading in part as follows:

And no renewal of the license for an existing station of any other class than a broadcasting station shall be granted for longer periods than two years; and that no original radio license or the renewal of an existing license shall be granted after the date of the passage of this resolution unless the applicant therefor shall execute in writing

a waiver of any right or of any claim to any right, as against the United States, to any wave length or to the use of the ether in radio transmission because of previous license to use the same or because of the use thereof.

This resolution, however, failed to receive the signatures of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate prior to adjournment, and therefore did not become a law until Congress again assembled last December. This resolution, now a law, unquestionably put the stamp of approval of both Congress and the President upon the tenant-at-will theory so far as the ether and its use is concerned. But, Mr. President, notwithstanding all this, it is an amazing fact that the bill now before us, as reported by the conferees, leaves us at the mercy of vested rights by virtually abandoning the tenant-at-will theory. A: evidence that such is the case, consider the following facts:

First. The conferees have stricken out the corresponding tenant-at-will provision in the Senate bill and substituted the following:

No station license shall be granted by the commission or the Secretary of Commerce until the applicant therefor shall have signed a waiver of any claim to the use of any particular frequency or wave length or of the ether as against the regulatory power of the United States.

Mark the words—

the regulatory power of the United States.

No one questions the right of Congress to regulate the use of radio. Therefore no licensee would renounce anything of value by signing such a waiver. What we have been fighting for is not a waiver against "the regulatory power of the United States" but for a waiver of any right to use the ether—an entirely different thing. Of course, the great radio interests wanted the conferees' wording. They are prepared to claim vested rights and desire to avoid litigating the question at this time, as, under the Senate bill, they would be compelled to do, should they refuse to sign the waiver provided for therein. What they want is time for the seasoning of their claims.

Why did the Senate members of the conference agree to this fundamental change? Because, we are informed, that the ultimatum of some of the House conferees is that the bill must go through in its present identical form or else it will be killed, and, moreover, there will be no other radio legislation at this session of Congress. Is not this attitude significant?

Second. The bill as passed by the Senate provided that the sale of any radio station should not be approved by the Secretary of Commerce if the price paid therefor should exceed the physical value of the property transferred. The purpose of this provision was to emphasize that nothing of value—such as a vested right—might be conveyed in the transfer of a radio station other than the physical property. This provision is stricken out of the Senate bill as it comes from conference. Why? Because it negates the idea of vested rights, and the great radio interests believe that the measure, in the form in which it is now before us, if it does not openly approve the theory of vested rights, at least implies a denial of the tenant-at-will theory.

Of course, the Senate members of the conference have also agreed to this change; and why? Because, we are informed, some of the House conferees have delivered themselves of an ultimatum to the effect that the bill must go through in its present identical form or else it will be killed, and there shall be no radio legislation. Indeed, is not this attitude significant?

Third. The Senate bill as it went to conference provided that in case of war or other emergency, should the Government see fit to close any radio station, that, under the terms of its license, the Government should not be liable for damages because of such mere closing. This provision is absolutely in accord with the tenant-at-will theory and was inserted in the bill because of that fact, but, Mr. President, the bill now before us, as it comes from the conferees, no longer contains this provision. Why? Because it negates the theory of vested rights.

This, too, has been agreed to by the Senate conferees because of the ultimatum of some of the House Members of the conference to the effect that this bill must be approved by the Senate in this identical form or else it will be killed, with no hope of other radio legislation during this session. What could be of greater significance?

Fourth and finally. The pending bill as it comes from the conferees includes new matter in the form of a repeal of the present law. I refer to the joint resolution adopted just before the adjournment of the last session of Congress and signed by the President in December, 1926, which provides for—

a waiver of any right, or of any claim to any right, as against the United States, to any wave length or to the use of the ether in radio

transmission because of previous license to use the same or because of the use thereof.

In lieu thereof this bill, as it comes from conference, requires merely—

a waiver of any claim to the use of any particular frequency or wave length or of the ether as against the regulatory power of the United States—

something entirely different, indicating an evident intention to abandon the tenant-at-will theory which is now the law of the land.

You may well ask why the Senate conferees agreed to this repeal—a practical capitulation. Again we are told that it is the ultimatum of some of the House conferees that this law should be repealed, otherwise there will be no radio legislation during this session of Congress. Had the conference included the great radio interests, this ultimatum would not be surprising. As it is, however, in view of what has gone before, its significance is overpowering.

Mr. President, three times has the Senate gone on record approving the tenant-at-will theory respecting the use of the ether; first, in 1924, when the bill which I introduced during that session was passed and sent to the House; a second time when the Senate passed the pending radio bill as it came from the Interstate Commerce Committee; and finally when it adopted, in conjunction with the House, the joint resolution which became a law last December. Notwithstanding, however, the Senate is now asked not only to abdicate this reiterated position but to repeal the tenant-at-will theory now on the statute books. Moreover, the Senate is asked to abdicate its previous position, not because the Senate conferees have been convinced but because the House conferees have threatened to defeat any radio legislation at this session unless the bill as it comes from conference is accepted by the Senate.

Mr. President, this is not merely a matter of pride or stubbornness on the part of these conferees. The attitude adopted is for a purpose, and that purpose is to prevent, in my opinion, the enactment into law of provisions in this bill which negate the theory of vested rights in favor of the tenant-at-will theory. In view of this fact we should stand unmoved.

So far as we now know, the number of usable channels in the ether is limited, and they should be preserved for all time not for merely a handful of people but for all of the people.

As this bill now stands it is what the great radio interests want. They are supporting it from every corner of the United States. They are telling their listeners, necessarily unacquainted with its details, that a filibuster is in progress against the measure, that it is in danger, and that if their listeners want the air cleared up, to wire their Senators immediately to pass the bill. Not stopping there, they are charging individual Senators, including myself, with attempting to kill the bill through filibuster, although, as previously pointed out, up to to-day I have occupied the Senate floor upon this subject, from the time the bill was introduced in 1925 until now, but 48 minutes. Why such misrepresentation? Merely a determination to leave no stone unturned to force through this bill as reported by the conferees, and thus preserve, if possible, their claimed vested rights.

Indeed, we should stand unmoved. We should send the bill back to conference with instructions to make such changes as are necessary for the protection of the public. There is plenty of time. There is no danger that the bill will not ultimately pass.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a magazine which is entitled "Radio Doings," and on the sixteenth page I find this article:

HERE'S HOW

By Maj. Lawrence Mott, KFWO

[Editor's note.—A few suggestions on the puzzling radio situation as offered by a station owner.]

I do not know what the letters KFWO stand for.

During a program over my little station, latterly, I chanced to make mention of the fact that I had been asked by Senator DILL, father of the bill now in Congress, to let him have my views on the radio situation, and any suggestions that occurred to me. Listeners to KFWO have asked that I set forth my suggestions in our pages. Perhaps mine editor will permit?

Briefly: Put all stations off the air under at least 100 watts! And on the very reasonable theory that the man who can not afford the upkeep of that amount of power can not, ipso facto, afford the cost of good orchestras, artists, etc., for his microphones! I do not know if my readers are aware of it, but the ridding of the overburdened airs of everything up to 100 watts would release at least 25 per cent of the congested air channels! It is all very well to say that these

little fly-by-night 5, 10, 20, 50, and 100 watt stations (of which there are a vast quantity infesting—

I should like to call the Senate's attention to the word "infesting"—

the broadcast channels) do not reach out! Their programs may not, but their carrier waves do, and that is what causes the pestilential whine and squealing so obnoxious to listeners-in. I suggested to Senator DILL that if a cleaning out up to 100 watts did not have the desired results, keep on cleaning up to 250 watts! And if there were still interference, clean out to 500 watts.

They do not want to give any chance at all to the poor man, to whom God Almighty has given the free air—or at least we had presumed so up to now—when the Senate seems to think that it should be taken away from him and is possibly in a mood of mind to do it; but they want to turn the air over only to the rich, the powerful, and the mighty, to the men who have money, who are able, if you please, to purchase expensive and fine equipment. So the little farmer out in the country, who really needs the service, who is not able to take his family to town to the big operas—"grand operas," I believe they are called—or to the big moving-picture shows, or to some other kind of amusement, because he is not rich, because he does not own an automobile, and because he lives out on a farm and is poor, must not have a radio. This "Big Ike" says "steal it from him; take it away from him." I want to know if the Senate means to indorse that kind of proposition.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BLEASE. Yes, sir; what I am reading from is the Senator's mouthpiece, and I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DILL. Oh, no.

Mr. BLEASE. That is what the writer says.

Mr. DILL. The writer states he made those suggestions to me. I wish to tell the Senator from South Carolina, however, that this bill does not carry out those suggestions; it does not provide for the limiting of stations as this man has suggested. I was very glad to have his suggestions, but I did not follow them nor did the committee.

Mr. BLEASE. It will not take more than about 15 minutes after the President signs this bill to bring about the condition to which the magazine article refers.

With this much accomplished, fix the "ceiling" of power at 1,000 watts.

I am very frank in the prophecy that if all stations were compelled by law to use master-oscillators in their transmitters (thus absolutely fixing their wave and keeping it sharp, withal); if, shall we say, everything under 250 (or 500) watts, and over 1,000, were legalized off the air, then, O air pals o' mine, you would have splendid radio reception!

I can hear the yell from the smaller station owners as I write: "It's all very well for you, with plenty of money, equipment, to go to 500 watts, etc., to talk. But how about us who have also spent money in our equipment?" A very reasonable yell, I admit. But the laws of progress are immutable and unchangeable. Private property is condemned for improvements in cities, for instance. A board of appraisers decides what a just and fair price would be for the condemned property and, willy-nilly, the owner of it must conform—for the good of the whole. I suggested the same thing to Senator DILL, i. e., appraise all stations up to 100 watts (to begin with), legislate them off the air, and pay their owners. We are at once rid of a lot of troublesome mosquitoes. To be redundant, carry this scheme to 250 watts, or 500, if it is necessary to clear the air.

I see that Senator WALSH and a few others are holding up the bill in the Senate. If some sort of a bill does not pass at this session, everything except the most expensive superselective sets with loops, chiefly, might as well be used to light the morning fire, in so far as any use that their owners will get out of them.

The man who wrote that article expresses exactly what this bill means; he expresses an idea which is too prevalent in this country to-day, according to which every man would be deprived of rights unless he has ample means. That is what this bill means and nothing else. It does not say so; certainly not; only a fool would come here and bring in a bill which applied only to the rich; but this bill applies to them, and the author of the article in this radio magazine writes to that effect, and in a footnote says that a copy of it has been sent to the Congressmen and the Senators from the State of California.

Mr. President, has the Senate reached the point that it is not only willing to deprive the people of the country of their personal liberty, deprive the poor man of the right to take a drink, but to go further than that and deprive them of the benefit of using the air. Of course the rich people have plenty of liquor; everybody who has any sense knows that. All the prohibition

law does is to deprive the poor devil of a drink. It does not deprive any man of it who has \$2.50 and is able to spend it in that way; we all know that; and this bill deprives him of other privileges. It seems to me that we are trying to take from the people of this country almost every privilege or right, for now the Senate has reached the point where it actually wants to place the air, the God-given air, in the control of a few and refuse it to the poor people of this country.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLEASE. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. Apropos of what the Senator from South Carolina has said about the invidious discrimination worked by prohibition between the rich and the less fortunate members of society, I might say to him that some time ago I asked one of the leading criminal lawyers of Baltimore whose business has been that of defending traverses in prohibition cases whether he could recall the fact that any man of any social standing or influence had ever been convicted in the city of Baltimore of any violation of the Volstead Act. After meditating for a few moments he said that he could not.

Mr. BLEASE. That does not only apply to Baltimore, but it applies all over this country. I know it applies in the State of South Carolina; and I am absolutely certain that it applies in the city of Washington, for I know that there is nobody in the city of Washington who wants liquor who is deprived of it if he has the money with which to buy it. That is proved every day around us, and it is not necessary to go out to hunt it up, either.

I am in favor of radio legislation to regulate in a proper manner the use of the air; but when the editor of a magazine such as that from which I have quoted sets forth the purpose of the pending measure and the purpose of its authors to be to close the service of the air and the use of the air to all the people of this country except those who are able to buy the very finest equipment for their radios in order that they may not be worried, as he says, by the "mosquitoes" buzzing in then I think it is time the Senate should pause to consider where we are going.

The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] admitted that this was a bad bill. Is the Senate to be called upon to pass this bill when the very men who are advocating its passage themselves admit it to be a bad bill? Has the day come in America when the Senate will pass a bill knowing it is a bad bill, admitting it is a bad bill, on the theory of the man from whom I have quoted, "Let us get this measure, and then we will carry out our purpose and get what we really want"? I can not understand, to save my life, why the Senate should consider passing a bill the friends of which themselves admit is a bad bill. Is it only for the purpose of having an entering wedge? Is it only with the idea that if you can not get something better than this take this now and then later amend it so that you can get what you want, so that you deprive all the people of this country from the use of the radio except those who are able to buy the finest equipment and say to them, "You can get your fine grand opera; you can get your fine musicals, and so forth, and nobody else can interfere; nobody else can have the privilege of radio. It is for the select few."

I thought this was a democratic Government; I thought it was supposed to be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, but I begin to have a doubt as to that when the Senate, in the face of an article like the one from which I have quoted, and despite the fact that Senators who are advocating this bill admit that it is a bad bill, admit that it is wrong in principle, insist on hurrying it through to-night if necessary. I have no objection to that; I have not anything else to do, and I can stay here just as long as can anybody else. I do not propose to delay its passage, but I want to file my protest against any bill that is admitted by the men who bring it in here to be a bad bill.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. BLEASE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DILL. I do not want to sit here under the repeated statement of the Senator that those of us who bring in this bill say that it is a bad bill. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is opposing the bill, and he said it was a bad bill. Those of us who brought in the bill recognize that it is not perfect; it does not contain all the provisions we want it to contain; but we believe that it is a good bill and that it will be the beginning of the regulation of radio.

In regard to the editorial the Senator has read, I want to say that we can not prevent people from sending us suggestions. We ought to welcome suggestions; but when we did not adopt the suggestions that were made, we should not be charged with the result which he says would follow if we did adopt them.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I make the prediction on this floor now that if this conference report is adopted it will not be 12 months before men who are voting for it in this Chamber will be deprived of putting their views before the country over the radio. I make the further prediction that in less than two years it will be controlled for partisan political and religious purposes, and that when men want to put their views before the American Nation over the radio they will be deprived of that liberty, and that the select few only will be given the privilege of having the use of that machinery.

Personally, I do not want it. I do not want to talk to anybody I can not see. If I talk to an audience, I want to look at them, and I want them to see me. Then I can come near telling what they want; and if I get on the wrong track, and they begin to squint their faces up, I can go on something else that will please them if it is necessary. But I do not want a machine fixed here for the purposes of the select few, and that is all that this bill means. That is what it is brought in here for. That is its purpose.

I am not responsible for this man who has been referred to. He may be a fool, but I am not responsible for his having little enough sense to parade his ideas in print and get them into the hands of the Senate before they pass on this matter.

Why should we control the air? I have not heard any reason for it yet. I suppose after a while they will fix it so that only certain people can go up in the air in an airship. About that I will never be worried, because I never expect to ride in one. Consequently, that does not worry me the least bit; but I do think that Senators should not sit here as a matter of courtesy and vote for bills to please somebody. I think it is too great a question, and that the Senate should stop and consider before they vote to put the control of the air of this country in the hands of anybody.

Somebody said that this bill puts the control of the air in the hands of Herbert Hoover. Very well; I do not know that that is so bad. I understand that he is the President's legal adviser; that he is his adviser on agricultural matters; that he is his adviser on matters of commerce, and I suppose on theology, too, and everything else connected with the Cabinet; but I do object, so far as I am individually concerned, to turning over to him or any other man or any set of men such control as this bill gives.

I presume the bill is going to pass; but I wanted to go on record just this far, so that when I go back to my people I can say to them that I did all I could, and that was to register my protest. I want to be in a position, when certain things happen in the campaign of 1928, where the finger of scorn can not be pointed at me, and it can not be said, "You kept us from receiving the proper kind of information that would have been given to us by some people had not this bill been enacted into law."

It steals my State's right to control its own, and I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16249) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 and 34 to the said bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16576) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 to the said bill, and concurred therein.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MEANS. Mr. President, on this day there was held in this Capitol a conference of the commanders in chief and the national commanders of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans—the first time in our history when we have ever gathered together to cooperate in the expression of the views of the great body of veterans throughout the United States. They have authorized me to be their voice in presenting a memorial to

the President, to the Congress, and to the people of the United States.

Therefore, not to take up the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD their unanimous statement of the matters considered, and their action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be placed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

This conference is the result of a mutual understanding among the five commanders in chief and national commanders of the war veterans' organizations, after communication one with another; it being decided as a result of this mutual understanding that the time was ripe and the necessity exists for us to declare ourselves upon national preparedness and the condition of our national defenses. This question is much considered by the public generally and by the executive and legislative branches of our Government. It is of peculiar interest and concern to the veterans of all wars.

We are a peace-loving people and earnest supporters of limitation of armament among the nations of the world. We commend any and all efforts toward a mutual understanding between the nations. We desire the settlement of international disputes by methods of arbitration and mutual agreement. The invitation of His Excellency the President of the United States to the nations of the world to meet and discuss proper methods of applying an agreement for limitation of armament must meet the commendation of all people.

The following is the statement of the conference on the subject of national defense:

To His Excellency the President, to the Congress, and to the people of the United States:

The great body of war veterans in this country are sincere advocates of peaceful settlement of international disputes. They know the horrors of war. The Government of the United States has never unfurled its battle flag for conquest or aggression, but only in defense of human rights. It has always led in the matter of armament limitation and has scrupulously adhered to the terms of such treaty arrangements.

The world is troubled with strife and armed conflicts. We have the inescapable responsibility to provide for an adequate national defense.

All of American wars in the past have been fought by its citizen soldiers. In all these wars inadequate preparations needlessly sacrificed the lives of thousands of young Americans, who were forced to fight, insufficiently equipped and trained. This prolonged the wars and greatly increased the public debt. As a result of these experiences, a national defense act was created making provisions for the training and equipping of our citizen soldiers that a needless sacrifice of life could be avoided.

Therefore, we, James Tanner, past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic; RICE W. MEANS, commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans; Theodore Stitt, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Howard P. Savage, national commander of the American Legion; and John V. Chinnin, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, representing millions of men and women of our organizations, in conference assembled, this 18th day of February, 1927, under the very dome of our Nation's Capitol, do unanimously request, yea, demand, the carrying out of the spirit and intent of the national defense act, and providing sufficient appropriations for that purpose. Also the immediate passage of an act providing for sufficient appropriations to build a Navy equal to that of any other country in all the world.

Our national defense must not be crippled under a plea of economy or pacifism.

The enunciations of the several conventions of our organizations pledge us to support and dedicate our endeavors of service to our country, that it may live and prosper in peace, through the maintenance of an adequate Army and Navy.

AMERICANISM

There exist to-day many definitions or explanations of the term "Americanism." Some attempt to determine it in degrees and percentages, and others to meet every condition of life. All veterans realize that one of the essentials to any legitimate definition of Americanism is a willingness or eagerness to defend our country against all its enemies. There is no one better qualified than the war veterans of this country to define Americanism so that the younger generation might have a concrete, clear definition and understanding of the term. This is the definition agreed to:

"Americanism is an unflinching love of country, loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

HOSPITALIZATION

There is pending before the Congress of the United States a reorganization bill which attempts to make a department of welfare and education. There is also pending before one of the branches of the

Congress a bill to transfer the board of governors of the national homes to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Bureau.

A question which concerns the veterans of all wars at this time is one of hospitalization. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau has definite views upon the subject. It is the desire, where possible, to have all veteran organizations cooperate, with an understanding and mutual regard of the difficulties confronting each of them, and to have a proper administration of the relief extended to all veterans. General Hines accepted an invitation to be present and did express his views to the conference. This is a matter of much concern and should be discussed and determined in the near future. It is of the utmost concern to all veteran organizations.

A plea by Corporal Tanner, past commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the consolidation of all agencies of the Government for the relief and hospitalization of veterans of all wars under one Federal head was made to the conference of national commanders of the veterans' organizations. This was discussed at length and it was agreed the commanders would report the subject to their respective organizations for action at their next annual encampment or convention.

EMERGENCY OFFICERS' BILL

The conference unanimously urged upon Congress the enactment of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill for the retirement of the disabled emergency Army officers.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3331, Order of Business No. 666. I will say to the Senators in charge of the appropriation bill that if this motion be agreed to I shall immediately lay aside the bill temporarily in order that they may be heard upon the appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. BRUCE. What is the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3331, to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the senior Senator from California of course has just moved to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3331, which is the Boulder Canyon bill. Am I correct in my understanding of the motion?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHURST. I am sure the Senator would not attempt to proceed to-night with the consideration of that bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the motion be agreed to, I will say to the Senator from Arizona, as I have said to the Senators in charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, that I shall immediately lay it aside temporarily, in order that they may take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I must ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this motion is debatable. I want to see the Senate take up the Boulder dam bill and consider it. I have not given to the bill the study that the question deserves; but if the motion prevails we must not forget that during the remainder of the session we are going to act under unanimous consent here.

I have been very much interested in the Muscle Shoals matter, which has been before the Senate for a long time.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I will withdraw the request for the yeas and nays and at the appropriate time simply ask for a quorum.

Mr. HARRISON. The Muscle Shoals matter has been here for a number of years. A joint committee was appointed by the Congress to receive bids. Those bids were received, and the joint committee made their report and recommendation. There is a bill on the calendar dealing with the subject matter. That bill has been recommended for passage. I appreciate the fact that it is going to be very difficult to get the bill up for consideration during the remaining days of this Congress; but it does seem to me that there ought to be given to the Senate an opportunity to vote on whether or not we are going to consider the recommendations of the joint committee.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. If there is prolonged debate in connection with the bill that the Senator from California has moved to take up, I desire to make a motion to take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill; and that, of course, is the senior motion.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that the Senator from California would not raise any objection to taking up the appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Not a bit. I will lay it aside at once temporarily.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that; but the difficulty, may I say to the Senator from California, is that the Muscle Shoals bill will have to be taken up upon a motion, and if the motion should prevail it would displace the other matter.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Mississippi, may I propound an inquiry to the Senator from California? The pending appropriation bill is the District bill. We shall have two or three conference reports on other appropriation bills, and we shall also have the general deficiency appropriation bill. Does the generous spirit which the Senator has expressed regarding the pending bill apply to all the appropriation bills?

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, certainly, sir, and I so state now; and I shall be delighted to take up with the Senator from Mississippi the particular question to which he has referred, if this motion shall prevail, and see if some arrangement can not be made by which he may be heard.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator, of course, realizes that there is a great difference of opinion on the question of Muscle Shoals—

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And that the bill can not be brought up by unanimous consent. I imagine somebody would object. I am wondering, therefore, if the Senator from California and other Senators would agree, say, that on Monday or Tuesday not more than an hour of the time of the Senate—a certain time—be given to the consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion has no preference after 2 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from California knows, of course, that the matter to which he refers is going to lead to a long-drawn out debate. As far as I am personally concerned, opposed to the bill as I am—and I shall use all the power that I have in my body to see that a vote is not taken—I am going to ask the Senator from Arizona and other Senators who are opposed to the bill to allow the bill to be taken up and then after it is discussed for a day or two, say, I give notice to the Senator that I am going to move to displace the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Very well; that is the privilege of the Senator from Utah. I assume, of course, that every bit of power he has in his body, as he states, he will present in opposition to this measure, because it is a human-interest measure; but, nevertheless, let us take up the bill if we can. Then the subsequent matters to which he refers may be ultimately determined.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator feels that way, we might just as well discuss the bill at the time of taking it up. I thought I was doing a favor to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right; then let us take up the bill.

Mr. MOSES. It can be discussed under the motion which the Senator has just made to take it up.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly. The Senator from California spoke to me about taking up the bill, and I told him I would do what I could to let it come up.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right; let us take it up, then.

Mr. SMOOT. But the lecture the Senator gave me—

Mr. JOHNSON. The lecture that the Senator from California gave to the Senator from Utah was in response to the lecture of the Senator from Utah concerning the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not lecture the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know whom the Senator from Utah was lecturing if he was not lecturing me.

Mr. SMOOT. There was no lecture. It was not a lecture at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right; let us omit the lectures, then, and allow the bill to be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the bill being taken up as I said to the Senator, and I think I promised him.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right.

Mr. SMOOT. I have done what I said I would do. I ask the Senator from Arizona and I ask other Senators who are opposed to the bill to permit it to be taken up.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me express my gratitude to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I wish it understood that I am not agreeing to anything.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I assume that the motion of the Senator from California will prevail.

Mr. KING. Do not assume that.

Mr. ASHURST. It seems obvious that the Senate is willing to discuss the bill, but I wish it distinctly understood that I have pending a motion to strike from the bill those portions thereof which I say raise revenue, it being my contention that under the Constitution of the United States a bill to raise \$125,000,000 of revenue can not legally be proposed in the Senate and considered. I am notifying the able Senator from California, who will be in charge of the bill, if he will give me his attention, that I wish to be heard on my motion first before the merits of the bill are gone into. I think I have a right, and I think the Senate has a right, to have that question determined first. So to-morrow morning, or as soon thereafter as I may, I shall ask for action on my motion, though I shall not discuss it at any length. I merely wanted to have my position known.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona, as he states, has made a motion of exactly the character he indicates. If to-morrow morning, when the bill is presented, if it be presented then, the amendment I propose does not meet his objection, he ought to be heard, and I have not the slightest objection and will insist that he shall be heard, as he shall desire.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator can get his bill up on motion, I want him to have it taken up, but I do not believe that it is necessary at this time to delay all the appropriation bills that are ready to be taken up. Pretty nearly every Senator in the body is standing on his feet now in opposition to the bill which the Senator is trying to get up, as I understand it. The Senator has been very considerate, and if I make a senior motion to take up an appropriation bill, which under the rule I can do—

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, that is a motion which, as I understand it, does not take precedence at this particular time. If the motion which I have presented be carried, I will do exactly what the Senator from Wyoming asks. He is entirely in error in thinking that the Senators who are upon their feet are opposed to the bill. All Senators are interested in legislation of one kind or another, and we want to accommodate everyone if we can, but here is a bill which is entitled, at least, to a hearing, and I am asking merely for a hearing upon it.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I want simply to say one thing, and I say it because Senators know I am very much interested in at least two other measures, one the bill to reorganize the Commerce Department and the other the customs reorganization bill.

I think we ought to have a vote upon both those measures, but I think the Senator from California, who has waited here since last spring, is entitled to an opportunity to present his measure. While I am for these other bills, and am really more interested in them than I am in the Senator's bill, I shall vote with him for an opportunity to have a hearing upon the bill he desires to bring before the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not want to keep the Senator from getting a vote on his bill, but I want to add to what the Senator from Mississippi has said about consideration of the Muscle Shoals legislation that we certainly ought to have a day or part of a day set apart to consider that measure at this session of Congress, and I hope the Senator from California will work with us to that end.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I shall do so.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. It occurs to me that under the existing circumstances the wise thing to do is to adopt the motion made by the Senator from California. He has agreed to lay the measure aside temporarily to permit the appropriation bills to be passed. Undoubtedly this measure is of such importance to the western section of the United States that it should at least be considered by this body. The measure has been on the calendar a long time, the country is more or less familiar with it; there is a demand that the legislation be enacted—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. KING. There may be a demand from a restricted area; but I want to assure the Senator that the demand is not so widespread as he may imagine it to be.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, that is a matter to be thrashed out. It is to be regretted that there is any sort of division among the Western States on the proposition, but whether there be or not, it is a question which really demands consideration by the Senate of the United States. That western section is a part of this country, and it ought to be developed in any and every way in which it can be developed to further the interests of its civilization and its citizenship.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I realize that there is some difference in the West with regard to the bill in its present form. As to whether there will be differences as to general legislation after amendments shall be adopted by this body is another question. It is absolutely impossible to determine what the form of the bill will be after the Senate acts on amendments. The only way we can find out is to take it up and see what amendments are adopted. I do not know that there will be anyone opposed to the bill if certain amendments shall be adopted. Practically the whole country is anxiously waiting for legislation to control the floods in the Colorado River, so that the imminent danger of destruction in the Imperial Valley will be removed. I certainly would like to know what the amendments are and what we can adopt, and how far we will get.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I simply desire to say that I am in favor of the Senator's bill and expect to vote for it. There is another bill on the calendar, however, dealing with what everyone knows is a very important matter, which I think ought to be passed and ought to be passed promptly. I refer to the bill relating to the reorganization of the Prohibition Unit and the Customs Bureau. There is quite a controversy about that measure. There are likely to be several amendments made, and I do not want to see that bill fail. I think we should pass it, and I think we should pass it at the first opportunity. But it seems to be generally considered that this Boulder Dam bill should be taken up now.

What I wanted to say frankly to the Senator from California was that while I am in favor of his bill, if it runs along two or three days and a proposal is made to take up this other bill, I shall vote to take it up. I would not like to vote to take up the Senator's bill and then vote to have it displaced, but I wanted to explain my position with reference to it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have to take that chance in getting this bill up, I confess.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I want the Senator from Washington to understand that he is not unique in the position he takes, because there are others of us here who have bills in which we are interested.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not assume I was unique, but I wanted the Senator from California to understand, if I asked to have his bill displaced, why I did it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I have no desire to try to delay this Boulder Dam proposition, but I am intensely interested in the Muscle Shoals measure. Will not the Senator permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request before he presses his motion?

Mr. MOSES. I can say now that I am going to give unanimous consent to nothing until a vote is had on the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. HARRISON. Then I say now that the motion will not be voted on right now.

Mr. MOSES. In that case we will listen to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no use in that. We can get together, because I am asking for nothing exceptional.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I think I have the floor, and I beg my friends from Mississippi and New Hampshire not to grind me between the two.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the Senator will not be ground between the two.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not want to get into a situation, through a difference between the Senators, whereby my motion

may not be put. What is it the Senator from Mississippi desires?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to submit my unanimous-consent request, I will do so. I desire that on next Wednesday or Thursday at 2 o'clock—

Mr. SMOOT. Make it Wednesday.

Mr. HARRISON. Wednesday, say, at 2 o'clock, a motion be considered by the Senate to take up Senate bill 4106—that is, the Muscle Shoals measure—and that it be considered for two hours, one hour of which is to be used by those in favor of the motion and one hour by those against the motion, and that a vote be taken at the end of the time on the motion.

Mr. MOSES. I can not give consent to any agreement of that sort, which looks to a division of time and control of the time on the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the suggestion as to the division of time, and let it end with the provision as to two hours.

Mr. MOSES. Nor do I agree to the fixing of a definite time for taking a vote. If the Senator wishes to have a moot court debate here for two hours on the Muscle Shoals problem next Wednesday, I shall not object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit this interjection, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEN] has discussed this matter with the Senator from Mississippi and with me, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It was agreed that I should make a motion to recommit on behalf of the committee. I am willing to withhold that motion if a limited time is taken on the motion presented by the Senator, and I think he ought to be quite content with the modifications suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire that two hours be given to the discussion of the subject next Wednesday. I assure the Senator that during that time I shall not interpose a motion to recommit. It is simply left as an agreement for debate.

Mr. MOSES. If the unanimous-consent agreement should so be drawn as to have it understood that at the conclusion of the two hours' debate the Senator from Oregon would be free to offer his motion to recommit, I would not object.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. When the Senator has yielded the floor I shall speak. I do not want to take the Senator from the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will not the Senator from Utah permit my motion to be put?

Mr. KING. After I make an observation or two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let the unanimous-consent agreement be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will not the Senator from Mississippi state his request again?

Mr. HARRISON. That on next Wednesday, at 2 o'clock—

Mr. JOHNSON. I will agree to anything offered by the Senator from Mississippi in that regard that I can agree to. However, I do not know that an agreement from me at this time would be of any value.

Mr. HARRISON. I was just stating my request at the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. It is that on next Wednesday at 2 o'clock a motion be considered by the Senate to take up Senate bill 4106; that two hours be given for its discussion; and that at the end of that time the Senator from Oregon may, if he desires, make a motion to refer to a committee; and that a vote be taken at the expiration of two hours on the motion to refer; and if that shall be defeated, then the vote shall be taken on the motion to take the bill up.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not know that I have ever objected to any unanimous-consent request, but I must object unless these agreements are made subject to the consideration of appropriation bills. It seems to me we have got off the track lately a little too far. I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will permit me, I will step aside any time for the Senator from Wyoming on any proposition.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Mississippi if his unanimous-consent proposal involves voting on the bill at the end of the two hours?

Mr. HARRISON. Either within that time or at the end of the two-hour period; either on a motion to take the bill up or on a motion of the Senator from Oregon to recommit it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to understand the last statement of the Senator. Do I understand his unanimous-consent request to be that at the expiration of the two hours a vote shall be taken on the final disposition of the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. No; on a motion to proceed to its consideration or on a motion, if the Senator from Oregon should elect, to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will allow me, I want to make this statement: Last year we appointed a committee to study the Muscle Shoals proposition; they have made a report, and I think they are entitled to the respect of the Senate to the extent that some action shall be taken in reference thereto. The recommendation of the committee can not pass this body at this session; but I think the committee is entitled to be heard, and the Senate should be allowed to take such action on their report as the report deserves. I am sure it will be defeated, as it ought to be.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from South Carolina that I am prompted by the same reasons to offer the unanimous-consent request. It is out of respect to the committee that something should be done by the Senate in reference to its recommendation.

Mr. SMITH. That is all right.

Mr. PITTMAN. There should be a provision that any unfinished business then before the Senate should be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question? Is it his understanding under his own request, at the end of two hours' debate, if the motion to recommit fails, that thereupon immediately and without further delay or debate a vote shall be taken upon the final passage of his measure?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, no; but a motion to proceed to the consideration of it.

Mr. MOSES. Let it be stated in form of words.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is proposed, by unanimous consent, that on next Wednesday, February 23, 1927, at 2 o'clock p. m., a motion to take up Senate bill 4106 be considered, and that at the end of two hours a vote be taken on a motion to recommit or a motion to proceed to its consideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would a motion to recommit be in order at a time when the bill was not before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that such a motion would not be in order if the bill were not before the Senate, unless the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. MOSES. We can move to recommit any measure on the calendar at any time.

Mr. McNARY. It would not operate in that fashion. If the motion to take it up should prevail, then the bill would become the unfinished business. I could move to recommit it, which motion would be in order at that time. If the motion to take it up failed, there would be no need to present a motion to recommit. Hence, either way we look at it, either or both would be proper.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to call the attention of the Senator from California to the effect of the request. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to and the motion to take up the Muscle Shoals matter prevails, then the Boulder Dam proposition is set aside. Does the Senator want to enter into that kind of an agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON. No, I do not; but if I can enter into a two-hour agreement, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, I am willing to enter into it if, parliamentarily, I do not destroy my position.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator enters into the unanimous-consent agreement, assuming, of course, that the motion of the Senator from Mississippi should prevail, then the bill of the Senator from California would no longer be the unfinished business.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It can be covered by simply including in the unanimous-consent agreement a provision that at the hour agreed upon the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside for two hours.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will not that accomplish the Senator's purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. It will not do it if the motion of the Senator from Mississippi prevails, because that would mean that the Senate would then proceed to consider the Muscle Shoals measure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska is right. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that we can lay aside the unfinished business temporarily, but when, by motion, we proceed to the consideration of another measure, it automatically displaces the unfinished

business. I would like to see an arrangement of this kind entered into.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from California that he could lose nothing by the agreement, because the Senator from Mississippi might, at the end of the two hours, without any agreement whatsoever, make the motion to take up the Muscle Shoals bill, and if that motion should prevail, it would displace the bill of the Senator from California, anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON. That was the thought in my mind, that the right exists to make such a motion at any time.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that whether we agree that we may have two hours of debate and then have the motion is of no consequence at all, because the Senator from Mississippi may in any event make the motion at any time.

Mr. NORRIS. The only difference is that the Senator, by his unanimous-consent agreement, would limit debate on the motion so it would take only two hours. If he did not make such an agreement, the debate would be unlimited; but if the motion prevails then the bill of the Senator from Mississippi is before the Senate and the bill of the Senator from California is laid aside.

Mr. JOHNSON. That would be the fact as to any motion that might be made and prevail concerning any other bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON. I can not for the life of me see, therefore, that any harm is done by entering into the agreement, although I do not want to jeopardize at all the bill in which I am so deeply interested. I can not see that any harm is done by according to the request of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from California must remember that if the motion prevails to take up the Muscle Shoals bill, he can at the very first opportunity get the floor while it is pending, and make a motion to take up any bill on the calendar that he desires.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska, then, if there is any harm or any injury which can result from agreeing to what the Senator from Mississippi asks?

Mr. NORRIS. But what good does it do?

Mr. JOHNSON. It does not do any good, except that it pleases the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. NORRIS. He can make the motion anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON. The request of the Senator from Mississippi limits debate to a period of two hours upon the matter suggested by him.

Mr. HARRISON. If my motion to proceed to the consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill should prevail and any question should arise because consideration of the Boulder Dam bill was then not finished, I think those in charge of the Muscle Shoals proposition would gladly lay it aside until the measure in which the Senator from California is interested was disposed of.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we reverse the operation. That would make the bill of the Senator from Mississippi the unfinished business and he would lay it aside temporarily, so that the Senator from California might continue the consideration of his bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not intend to reverse operations at all; but I am unable to see that giving the Senator from Mississippi the two hours he suggests would jeopardize the bill in which I am interested.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senate ought to dispose of the Muscle Shoals proposition. There is a matter pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which will probably result in a compromise proposition being reported. So far as taking up the report of the special committee is concerned, while I have not any particular objection to it, there is no doubt that if it prevails there must necessarily be extended debate on a bill of such importance, which has not yet been debated at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will not let a vote be had upon my motion? I shall be very glad to meet with the Senator from Mississippi and agree upon any course that will not jeopardize either his interests or mine.

Mr. HARRISON. Because of the present confusion, may I say that if the Boulder dam proposition is still before the Senate on next Wednesday some one—if there is no one else to do it, I shall do it myself—will ask unanimous consent to lay it aside temporarily and proceed with the motion to consider the Muscle Shoals proposition, together with the motion to recommit which will be offered by the Senator from Oregon. Then if the unanimous-consent request is denied, I shall make the motion, if no one else does, to proceed to the consideration of the Muscle Shoals resolution.

Mr. ASHURST obtained the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I forgive Senators who have just called for a vote. I have been a sinner too often myself in that respect to say anything that might appear to be censorious of any Senator who calls for a vote.

I assure the Senate that I shall take only a few minutes at this juncture, but I ought now to state, and the Senate is entitled to have, in a few brief and bold sentences, a résumé of what this bill is.

First let me say to Senators that not during their entire service will they be called upon to vote upon a measure of more importance, a measure of more complexity, or a measure concerning which there is a more sharply divided public opinion than the particular question they are now invited to consider. I urge Senators to be patient, because I shall take but a few minutes.

The Colorado River drainage basin in area is about 250,000 square miles.

Through this Colorado River drainage basin there flows the Colorado River, about 1,700 miles long. The percentage of water which the States within the Colorado River Basin contribute, respectively, to the Colorado River is as follows:

	Per cent
Arizona	28
California	00
Colorado	53.7
Nevada	.3
New Mexico	1
Utah	7
Wyoming	10
Total	100

In 1921 a bill was passed by Congress authorizing a compact among the seven States of the Colorado River Basin looking toward a division of the waters thereof among the seven States; the compact was drawn and thereafter all of the States, but Arizona, ratified the compact. The Arizona Legislature in 1923 refused to ratify the compact as executed; and again in 1925 Arizona refused to ratify the same as executed, and still refuses to do so. No well-informed man would assert that Arizona will ratify the seven-State compact in its present form. Upon Arizona's refusal to ratify, a six-State compact was entered into, and the signatory States were California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.

The bill now urged by the Senators from California is predicated upon and bottomed upon the said six-State compact.

When Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Nevada ratified the six-State compact they acted in good faith toward one another.

But what did California do as to the six-State compact? California, which contributes no water to the Colorado River, said, "California ratifies upon the condition that the Federal Government expend \$125,000,000 to build the Boulder Canyon project." California's ratification is predicated upon the expenditure of \$125,000,000 of Federal funds for California's benefit. California's attempted ratification was not a ratification in law. Utah has withdrawn, as she had a right to withdraw her ratification of the six-State compact, after California ratified in that conditional fashion. Utah gave notice that if conditional ratification were attempted by California Utah would withdraw from the six-State compact. Utah acted in superb good faith. California had ample notice as to what would be Utah's action and position if California attempted a conditional ratification.

I am not here to say aught against the State of California. It is a State of large area, of wealth, beauty, growth, public order, and glory. Politically, industrially, socially, economically, and financially, California is one of the most powerful States in the Union. A certain city in the southern part of the State has, within less than a third of a century, grown from a few thousand persons to over a million in population. This city's growth is so enormous as to be bizarre. It is dazzled by its own power and strength, and it is aggressive and dominant. This city is none other than Los Angeles, and with all its prestige and success, it is quite careless in its methods of distributing water which belongs to other States. What is California asking now? She is asking Congress to dip into the Federal Treasury to the tune of \$125,000,000 to build the Boulder Canyon project, for California's benefit, to the great harm and deadly injury of Arizona. She proposes a dam at Boulder Canyon in the Colorado River. That dam is proposed to be the highest dam in the world; within five feet as high as the Washington Monument. At Boulder Canyon there will be generated 550,000 primary horsepower. California practically demands the control of all the horsepower there, and if my

friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], is able to secure an amendment giving his State a few horsepower, I shall congratulate him.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I can not yield at this time.

Mr. PITTMAN. I merely desire to say that I am going to help the Senator secure some such amendment for Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. The city of Los Angeles says she needs a larger quantity of potable water and it is proposed that of the 550,000 primary horsepower to be generated at Boulder Canyon, over one-third thereof shall be forever dedicated to pumping 1,500 second-feet of water to an elevation of 1,700 feet and on to Los Angeles, 200 miles distant.

We invite Los Angeles to consider a dam higher up the river and thus send down by gravity the same potable water to Los Angeles and thus release this 200,000 horsepower of electrical energy for other purposes.

The logical and practical way to develop a river is to begin at its source and work toward its mouth. This bill proposes to reverse this logical and practical order of development.

ARIZONA

Ninety-seven per cent of the entire area of the State of Arizona is within and constitutes 43 per cent of the total area of the Colorado River drainage basin.

Arizona contributes about 28 per cent of the waters of the Colorado River.

Of the 4,000,000 firm horsepower of potential hydroelectric energy in the lower basin, seven-eighths thereof is in Arizona, but the Boulder Canyon plan of development would allot to Arizona only an insignificant fraction of this hydroelectric power.

Of the lands in Arizona susceptible of irrigation, all thereof to be irrigated must obtain their water from the Colorado River or its tributaries in Arizona; they have no other waters from which to draw.

CALIFORNIA

Only 2½ per cent of the Colorado River drainage basin is in California.

California contributes no water to the Colorado River.

The Boulder Canyon plan of development allots to California 57 per cent of the waters of the Colorado River.

The Boulder Canyon plan allots to California practically all of the hydroelectric power to be generated in the lower basin of the Colorado River.

California has 18,000,000 acres of land irrigable by waters other than by the waters of the Colorado River.

Of potential hydroelectric energy California has 6,000,000 horsepower which may be developed within her borders on streams other than the Colorado River or its tributaries.

The Boulder Canyon plan allots to California practically all the hydroelectric power developed in Arizona, but California would not permit Arizona to direct the allocation of the hydroelectric power developed on California streams.

The bill is simply, solely, and only a California bill. It is a tribute to the genius and statesmanship of the men whom California has sent to the House of Representatives and to the Senate that they have been able to make such great headway with such an unfair bill. The bill, however, is exempt from the vice of hypocrisy. It plainly and sedulously proposes to sever Arizona's jugular. This bill is an attempt to coerce the State of Arizona into a compact objectionable to her people. It violates the fundamentals of State rights.

I have heard much talk lately, and properly so, regarding State rights. There is a general opinion that the Federal Government is encroaching upon and usurping the reserved rights of the States, and I am curious now to know if Senators, after talking so logically and so inveterately upon State rights will, upon this important question, thunder in the index and then fall in the text.

Arizona by virtue of its admission into the Union as a sovereign State took ownership as of the date of its admission of the waters of the Colorado River from high-water mark to high-water mark and to the bed of the stream thereunder where it lies wholly within the State and to the thread of the stream where it constitutes an interstate boundary in trust for the benefit of the people of Arizona, subject, however, to the jurisdiction of the United States to regulate commerce thereon with foreign nations and among the States.

The ownership of the State in the bed of the Colorado River is different in character from that which the State holds in lands intended for sale and different from that which the United States holds in the public lands which are open to pre-emption and sale.

The State's ownership in the bed of the Colorado River is held in trust for the people of the State by virtue of State sovereignty.

The ownership of the United States in the waters of the Colorado River and the bed of the stream prior to Arizona's statehood was in trust for the benefit of the people and the State when organized, subject only to the rights vested in the United States by the Constitution to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States.

No person or authority, not even the United States, can legally build any dam or other structure in the Colorado River where the same touches Arizona without the consent of Arizona.

Arizona as such owner has the exclusive control over the appropriation, diversion, and use of the waters of the Colorado River within the State, and has the legal right to prevent such waters from being diverted at any point within its borders and transported or taken beyond its borders to other States; neither can any waters of the Colorado River be legally diverted at any point within Arizona for any purpose whatsoever without the consent of Arizona.

Neither the great lawyer, the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTEIDGE], nor the great lawyer, the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], will rise here and say that the bed of the Colorado River in Arizona belongs to the Federal Government.

The bill is intended to be, and is, an attempt to coerce Arizona. One administration unsuccessfully attempted to coerce Arizona into joint statehood with New Mexico. Another administration unsuccessfully attempted to coerce Arizona upon certain provisions of her constitution, and those of the present administration who are attempting by this legislation to coerce Arizona will ultimately discover that they have simply been standing like large locomotives on a sidetrack, without driving rods, wasting their steam in vociferous and futile sibilation.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I have no familiarity with the bill, though I expect to make myself familiar with it before it comes to a vote. I wish to ask the Senator, do I understand that the bill proposes to divert water from the State of Arizona without the consent of the people of the State?

Mr. ASHURST. It does.

Without attempting to anticipate the arguments the able Senators from California will make, I assume they will argue that Imperial Valley is imperiled. The debate on this bill is going to be characterized by proper consideration. We need quite a little noblesse oblige nowadays; and I say that I sympathize with the Imperial Valley; that the State of Arizona is sympathetic toward Imperial Valley, and Arizona's Representative and her Senators are willing and anxious to vote any sum of money, be it \$50,000,000, to guard against the floods that might overwhelm Imperial Valley; but we do not intend that California, hiding and concealing herself under the sheep's clothing of a demand for flood control, shall become a wolf to enter into the State of Arizona and appropriate and take from Arizona all but an insignificant fraction of the potential electrical energy that may be developed by water power in Arizona on the Colorado River.

Arizona is a land of slow growth compared with California, and we do not intend that our future and our opportunity to expand and grow shall be foreclosed by the avidity of southern California, which is a country of rapid development.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator might suggest that there can be a dam constructed at a cost of not to exceed \$14,000,000 at Topock which will effectually desilt the waters of the Colorado River and give ample protection for many years to come to the inhabitants of the Imperial Valley; but they will not accept such a solution of the problem.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has accurately stated the facts.

Arizona's great inheritance is hydroelectric energy, called by imaginative France "white coal," and this brilliant characterization suggests a coal free from dust, easily handled, a supply inexhaustible, which, after being used on one project, flows on to projects below, and may be used again and yet again. This bill would take from Arizona her right to control this potential electric energy.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ASHURST. I ought to have yielded to the Senator from Nevada if I am going to yield to others, but I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did not desire to do more than to assure the Senator that I am going to help him secure an amendment providing power for Arizona.

Mr. BRATTON. The Senator from Arizona stated at the outset of his remarks that this bill rests upon the so-called six-State compact?

Mr. ASHURST. It is predicated upon the six-State compact.

Mr. BRATTON. Yes. Since this bill was drawn, however, Utah has withdrawn her act of ratification.

Mr. ASHURST. She has.

Mr. BRATTON. Is it the Senator's view that there is any existing compact now with reference to the Colorado River either a seven-State, a six-State, or any other compact?

Mr. ASHURST. There is no compact in existence such as is recognized and contemplated by the Constitution of the United States; indeed, I contend that California's pretended and attempted ratification was not a ratification in fact.

Senators, I thank you for your attention, and I will keep my promise and take my seat, but I shall discuss this bill at length at the earliest opportunity.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3331, the Boulder Canyon Dam bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3331) to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with amendments.

NATIONAL-ORIGINS QUOTAS UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read from the clerk's desk and lie over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 362), as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate a copy of the memorandum explaining the methods and processes employed by the six statistical experts appointed by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor in determining the quotas on the basis of nationality of origin of the population of the United States, which accompanied the quota board's report to the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie over under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4908. An act to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities;

S. 5622. An act authorizing the acceptance by the Navy Department of a site for an aviation training field in the vicinity of Pensacola, Fla., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 16888. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 19, 1927, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, February 18, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of mercy, God of might, we thank Thee that lov'st the eternal pursuit of the Father of us all. In the spirit of expectation and humility we approach Thee, and be gracious to hear our desires. Give us the support of Thy Holy Spirit, who can crush a mountain and yet would not hurt a little child! O come to us, sweet messenger of rest and help divine. Bless our fraternal interest in one another; may we share our bur-

dens; make our toil sweet and satisfying. We commend unto Thee those who lead our thought in our national affairs and those who sit in authority. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have called up the Committee on Rules and asked what rules would be presented to-day and to-morrow. It is the intention, immediately after the conference report on the War Department appropriation bill is disposed of, to proceed with the rule on providing expenses for participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments and then to take up the rule providing for a national arboretum this afternoon. After that will come the rule for the longshoremen's bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is a bill to expend \$500,000 for a few acres of marsh land.

Mr. SNELL. If I understand correctly, the Government can not live much longer unless we have an arboretum. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. BLAND. Can the gentleman state whether the longshoremen's bill is in final form? I understood it was to be amended.

Mr. SNELL. It has been definitely agreed by the chairman of the committee that the bill shall eliminate the fishermen.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman can get the printed bill in final form.

Mr. BLAND. The printed bill that I have seen does not eliminate persons engaged in the fisheries.

Mr. SNELL. That was the agreement, and if anything is necessary to clean that up—

Mr. BLAND. There is an amendment to take care of that situation which will be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. MICHENER. It is the purpose of the bill to eliminate fishermen. If it does not do that, the gentleman will have an opportunity to offer it on the floor of the House; and I, for one, will offer no opposition to it.

Mr. BLAND. Is it contemplated to consider the Senate amendment as one amendment, or will we be given an opportunity to amend the Senate amendment in accordance with the ordinary rules of the House under the five-minute rule?

Mr. SNELL. There will be ample opportunity for amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. It is the intention not to prevent any second amendments, and the ordinary rules of the House will obtain.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This is not a Senate amendment; it is a Senate bill without amendment.

Mr. BLAND. But the amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Virginia is afraid of an amendment in the third degree and there is a question, but that will be taken care of.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority leader would tell us what we are going to do to-day.

Mr. TILSON. The first thing coming up this morning is a conference report on the War Department appropriation bill. As soon as that is disposed of it is expected that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] will call up the conference report on the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor appropriation bill, and then will follow the special rules which have been mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And it is anticipated that that will take the day?

Mr. TILSON. We think that will be enough to cover the entire day.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. DO'WELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has just reported the bill H. R. 16551, and has added section 2 to the bill, over which the committee had no jurisdiction and no matter was referred to the committee on that subject. It is also not germane to the other part of the bill. I desire to reserve a point of order on section 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order on section 2 of the bill H. R. 16551.

ADDRESS OF FORMER SENATOR ROBERT L. OWEN, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a speech recently delivered by ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, recently made an important address before the Women's National Democratic Club outlining the difference between a liberal and a conservative, which I desire to bring to the attention of the people of the country. I have not seen the difference so well defined. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the people of the Nation.

The address of Mr. Owen is as follows:

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A LIBERAL AND A CONSERVATIVE?

Organized government ranges from an absolute autocratic, military monarchy to communistic democracy. It shades from the extreme right to the extreme left, passing from absolute monarchy to limited monarchy through various forms, including oligarchies operating through the form of republican governments with very limited suffrage, to a pure democracy with unlimited suffrage.

In a great republican democracy, such as the United States, the overwhelming body of American opinion is represented by the conservatives and the liberals voting as Republicans or as Democrats and crossing party lines. The conservatives themselves may be ultra-conservatives, moderate conservatives, or liberal conservatives, and the liberals gradually shade from conservative liberals down to the radicals, to the socialists, and finally to the communists.

The communistic element in America is inconsequential, and the socialist element is comparatively small. The dividing line between the conservatives and the liberals is found in the manner in which they respond to the doctrines of popular government and modern processes for protecting human life when in conflict with the acquisition or preservation of mere property rights.

A liberal would favor the initiative and the referendum, the means by which the people can initiate and pass any law they do want and or by referendum veto any law they do not want. The liberals are for it; the conservatives are against it.

In the matter of the recall, permitting the people to recall an official who is not satisfactory to the general public, the conservatives are against the recall and the liberals are for it.

In the mandatory primary giving the people the right to nominate candidates, the liberals are for it; the conservatives are against it. The conservatives think that the selected few have more sense than the untutored many.

In the preferential ballot, which eliminates minority nominations, the conservatives as a rule will incline against it; the liberals will incline to favor it, because they want majority rule and the conservatives prefer the rule of the minority, because it is to their advantage—on the sagacious doctrine of divide and conquer.

In the matter of direct election of Senators, the liberals were strongly for it; the conservatives were against it, because they do not confide in the wisdom of the common people to the same extent that the liberals do.

In the use of money on wholesale plan to nominate Senators, as in Pennsylvania, the conservatives think it perfectly proper to use whatever amount of money is necessary and they urge it on various ingenious grounds. For example, the education of the people through literature freely sent at whatever expense. The liberals prefer educating the people chiefly by a publicity pamphlet at public expense, rather than having millions of dollars expended by private individuals to influence the primary nominations. They urged this plan in Pennsylvania and were defeated by the conservatives.

The conservatives would favor employing at \$10 a day an unlimited number of watchers at the Pennsylvania polling places. The liberals object to this as essentially corrupt and equivalent to buying the nomination through the bribing of an army of watchers—in reality not of watchers but of hirelings. Neither conservatives nor liberals approve corruption. They both condemn it. The conservatives are not much in favor, however, of stringent corrupt practices prevention acts. The liberals are strongly for these acts.

It happens that often an individual is liberal in some respects and conservative in others. No human being can be finally classified as completely one thing or another. Men must be judged by their tendencies and on the principle of the parallelogram of forces and by the line in which they travel, due to their subconscious mentality.

The conservatives were opposed to woman suffrage. The liberals were for it, believing that the influence of women, on the whole, would be exerted along lines of morality and sound ethics and in the preservation of human life as against the modern forces of civilized society that destroy life in the struggle to acquire wealth.

The conservatives incline to favor intensively organized machine politics, while the liberals, believing in legitimate organization, oppose the extreme forms of machine politics, and particularly where there is developed bipartisan machine politics through which ambitious individuals may manipulate for private advantage the governing powers of the people.

The liberals favor cloture in the United States Senate. The conservatives do not favor this and the ultraconservatives hate it. The ultraconservative believes in the minority rule of the highly intelligent element, which he himself represents. The liberal believes in the majority rule, believing with Abraham Lincoln that all the people know more than some of the people, and that the vote of all of the people will result more favorably to the majority than the control of the majority by the minority.

The liberal favors child-labor laws to protect childhood in industry. The conservatives disapprove these laws and argue that parents ought to have the free right to direct the lives of their own children and the children have a right to work for the support of their fathers and mothers. The liberals insist that children should have the opportunity of education and of play during the tender years of childhood, and that on no pretext should this human right be denied for purposes of money making.

The liberal favors the protection of women in industry. The conservative would argue that every woman has a right to work as long as she pleases and make as much money as she can by this process.

The liberals favor a minimum wage. The conservatives oppose it. The liberals favor the eight-hour day. The conservatives oppose it until it is established and opposition becomes in vain. The liberals favor the workmen's compensation act and the insurance of those engaged in industrial labor. The conservatives generally have yielded to this proposal, although at first opposing it.

The liberals favored an income tax. The conservatives opposed it.

The liberals favored a progressive inheritance tax. The conservatives opposed it.

The liberals favored farm relief. The conservatives opposed it.

And the liberals will be found favoring the complete recognition of the sovereignty of Nicaragua; while the conservatives would favor sending war vessels and marines to back Diaz, who seized power by means of revolution backed by special interests engaged in exploiting concessions in Nicaragua.

Broadly speaking, the minds of the conservatives have a tendency to regard the conservation of property and the acquisition of property as the most important things to be protected by the Government. The liberals, on the other hand, while conceding the importance of protecting property and the acquisition of property, insist that the preservation of human life, the education of the people, the protection of their lives in industry, and the advancement of their physical and mental well-being, if found in conflict with the rights of property, must be regarded as superior to the rights of property, such as life itself is superior to the possession of material substances.

Many conservatives in politics have shown magnificent generosity in distributing the property acquired by them during a hard life of industrious labor, and even an extreme liberal is compelled to pay a tribute of admiration to the generosity often shown by conservatives who, as private individuals, are generous in the extreme.

Probably 85 per cent of the Democratic membership are liberal and probably a substantial majority of those who vote as Republicans are liberal, but the controlling leadership of the Republican Party is conservative, and such Republican leaders would favor the protection of monopolies in America with the higher prices they can impose on the people. They have prevented the control of such monopolies through the administration of the Department of Justice and have muzzled and broken down the powers of the Federal Trade Commission established by the liberal democracy under the liberal leadership of President Wilson.

They have rendered valueless the Tariff Commission and have deliberately raised the tariff schedules to a point which in many cases have prevented any foreign imports which might compete with monopolies in America, thereby cutting off the tariff revenue on such schedules and protecting monopoly from foreign competition, and thus have perfected the monopoly processes in America, at the expense of the consumer.

These Republican leaders should be held strictly responsible for the deflation of credit in 1920, 1921, and 1922, which bankrupted thousands of banks, bankrupted agriculture, and intensified the industrial depression which naturally followed the World War.

These Republican leaders opposed all of the great reforms put over by the liberals in 1914 to 1918, such as the Federal reserve act, the Clayton antitrust act, which declared that labor was not a commodity, etc.

It is not necessary for a liberal to accuse a conservative of being in bad faith. As a rule the conservatives are not in bad faith. They truly believe in the conservative doctrine and regard the acquisition of property and the preservation of property as the most im-

portant object of government. But the liberals are equally convinced that the preservation of the life, of the happiness, and the advancement of the people physically, morally, and spiritually, are still more important, and on this platform the liberals can afford to stand without apology.

The time has come when the liberals of America of all parties should find a way of sympathetic practical cooperation. The Democratic party seems to present a promising agency through which they might cooperate. The liberal Republicans have struggled for years to make the Republican Party a liberal party—long before the days of Roosevelt's revolt and the days of the La Follette revolt, and the time has come when they should consider how an effective cooperation might be brought about between the liberals of all parties, and put an end to conservative dictation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill H. R. 16888, an act granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills with the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5585. An act to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the southern branch of the Elizabeth River near the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, in the county of Norfolk, State of Virginia;

S. 5602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Blair, in the State of Nebraska, or its assignees, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Nebraska and Iowa;

S. 5603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the department of highways and public works of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Clinch River, approximately at Kyles Ford, on the Rogersville-Sneedville Road in Hancock County, Tenn.; and

S. 5671. An act to amend paragraph (c) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the transportation act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2. An act to further amend the national banking laws and the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 16888. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 4808. An act to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities; and

S. 5622. An act authorizing the acceptance by the Navy Department of a site for an aviation training field in the vicinity of Pensacola, Fla., and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee this day presented to the President of the United States for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 2. An act to further amend the national banking laws and the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the eradication or control of the European corn borer; and

H. R. 11803. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Juneau, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes.

BATTLESHIP "MAINE" MEMORIAL EXERCISES

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein the address of the Cuban ambassador at the Maine memorial exercises on Tuesday last, February 15.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the address of Señor Orestes Ferrara, the ambassador of the Republic of Cuba to the United States, at the memorial to those who died with the *Maine*, delivered at Fort Myer last Tuesday.

It was the twenty-ninth anniversary of the destruction of the *Maine*, on February 15, 1898, and the oration of the ambassador, eloquent and filled with the deepest sincerity, conveyed to the thousands in attendance a message of friendship and good will which should also be known to the Members of the Congress and the people of the United States.

The address of Ambassador Ferrara was as follows:

I am here as the representative of the Republic of Cuba to fulfill a sacred duty, that of participating with you in this act of religious and patriotic commemoration in honor of those who gave up their lives on the night of February 15, 1898, in the harbor of Habana.

The men who perished in the explosion of the *Maine* were not citizens of Cuba by right of birth, but they have been since then by a superior title, by the sacrifice of their lives, truly as rightful citizens of Cuba as the purest of our own native born. Death has made them ours, as much ours as they were yours exclusively while they lived.

They are remembered to-day in Cuba with the same deep feeling that their memory is revered here by their fellow countrymen, and as long as gratitude exists in the world, their sacrifice will be recalled by the people of Cuba, who will ever keep alive in their hearts a fervent and inextinguishable sympathy for those gallant sailors.

Many citizens of the United States have died for Cuba. In the verdant revolutionary fields, during the long struggles for independence which we waged, since 1851, noble spirits of your race fell in the cause of my country. Also on the battle grounds of Santiago, on the heights of El Caney, on the hills of San Juan, many Americans gave up their lives, serving at the same time the cause of your country and of mine. The blood shed by your heroes has mingled profusely with ours in the defense of Cuba's ideal. But the men whose martyrdom we recall to-day served even more effectively than the warriors who fought on the fields of battle for the independence of Cuba, because their sacrifice became exalted into a symbol, and out of that symbol came our victory.

In ancient times human lives were proffered to the gods, to obtain their protection; the brave men whose bodies were hurled into eternity on that fateful night, and whose sacrifice we commemorate to-day, were the victims of destiny, of the inscrutable designs of Providence, their lives being offered up in holocaust to the omnipotent and eternal goddess whose name is Justice.

The death of so many men, which seemed at first sight a useless waste of life, and which superficial historians perhaps considered as the painful consequence of a blind decree of fate, has been in fact one of the decisive pages of our history and of yours, and the most important for us on account of its far-reaching results.

Cuba redeemed—Cuba, an independent nation, a sovereign Republic, has erected a monument to perpetuate, in bronze and marble, the martyrdom and glory of the officers and crew of the battleship *Maine*. That monument, revered by everyone, stands at the very entrance of Habana, facing the majesty of the ocean. A hurricane recently tore down its massive columns and the cannon which had been raised from the bottom of the sea where the remains of the battleship laid to adorn the beautiful, artistic structure tremored once more. But in 1926, as in 1898, the blind and inhuman forces of nature were able to do less than the will of man, and the Cuban Government, responsive to the expressions of popular sentiment, has restored and is making still more beautiful that monument, which not only transmits to posterity the sorrow experienced by our generation but is at the same time a pact of honor and alliance between our two peoples, whom this tragic episode of their history unites in a common affliction.

Year after year the destruction of the *Maine* will be recalled; to one generation after another the history of the fateful event will be repeated, and time, instead of erasing the memory of it from the mind of man, will cause it to rise into greater prominence. The names of the United States of America and of Cuba will be constantly associated, and with their names the sentiments and ideals of the two peoples will also be intermingled. Success at times separates men; pain alone binds them together forever.

On this occasion I feel it my duty to declare that, although we are your close neighbors, we do not feel the pressure of your great power. The accusations of imperialism, on the contrary, find a palpable refutation in the untrammelled existence of the Republic of Cuba, from which no attribute of its sovereignty has ever been withdrawn, notwithstanding the statements sometimes made by mistaken friends or deceitful enemies.

The people of Cuba, who would be ready to offer up their lives again for the independence of their country and who prize their sovereignty as zealously as any other nation, because they have struggled and suffered more than any other people on earth to achieve it, can all affirm that they enjoy as full freedom as any people can enjoy,

even the most powerful in all the world. The secular ideal of Cuba—to live in political affairs as independent as she is geographically—has not been menaced by your Government; on the contrary, this ideal has always received its decided support. If a different conduct had been followed in the past, or if it were adopted in the future, such action would have meant, and would mean, depriving those who died on the 15th of February, 1898, and so many of the citizens of this country whose blood has been shed, of the essence of their glory.

With a deep feeling of reverence, the people of Cuba offer this prayer to-day: That the souls of the victims of the *Maine* may find in the beyond an eternal peace as deep and absolute as the sacrifice of their bodies was violent and appalling!

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 16249) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California calls up a conference report upon the Army appropriation bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16249) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 16, 18, 27, 38, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$82,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,370,998"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$124,688,704"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,936,034"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,683,253"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$504,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$858,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore

the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SURVEY OF BATTLE FIELDS"

"For defraying the cost of studies, surveys, and field investigations authorized in the act entitled 'An act to provide for the study and investigation of battle fields in the United States for commemorative purposes,' approved June 11, 1926, \$15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "of which not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended for the purpose of riprapping the bank and channel-matressing the river at Vicksburg, Miss., at such a point and in such a manner as may be necessary to make possible the permanent establishment of an interchange terminal at that point between railroads and the vessels of the Inland Waterway Corporation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 1 and 34.

HENRY E. BARBOUR,
FRANK CLAQUE,
L. J. DICKINSON,
BEN JOHNSON,
T. W. HARRISON,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
W. L. JONES,
DAVID A. REED,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16249) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 2: Appropriates \$82,400 for military post exchanges, instead of \$82,800, as proposed by the Senate, and \$64,140, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 3 to 14, both inclusive, relating to pay, and so forth, of the Army: Strikes out the increase of \$85,500 proposed by the Senate on account of aviation pay for commissioned personnel; strikes out the increase of \$20,625 proposed by the Senate on account of a munitions battalion; increases the sum of the reappropriations from \$808,961, as proposed by the House, to \$1,753,961, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates in direct appropriations \$124,688,704 instead of \$123,449,138, as proposed by the House, and \$124,794,829, as proposed by the Senate, the net result being that for identically the same objects proposed by the House the reappropriations exceed the House proposal by \$945,000 and the direct appropriations by \$1,239,566, a total increase of \$2,184,566.

On No. 15: Appropriates \$100,000 for expenses of courts-martial, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 16: Appropriates \$17,676,923, as proposed by the House, for subsistence of the Army, instead of \$17,700,094.50, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 17: Appropriates \$12,936,034 for regular supplies of the Army, instead of \$12,960,779, as proposed by the Senate, and \$12,925,279, as proposed by the House, the modified amount providing for 150 additional horses.

On No. 18: Appropriates \$3,626,724 for incidental expenses of the Army, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,656,724, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 19: Appropriates \$14,683,253 for Army transportation instead of \$14,693,153, as proposed by the Senate, and \$14,681,153, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$2,100 being on account of 150 additional horses.

On No. 20: Appropriates \$504,750 for horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, and so forth instead of \$562,500, as proposed by the Senate, and \$480,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$24,750 being on account of 150 additional horses.

On No. 21: Makes the appropriation for military posts available until June 30, 1929, as proposed by the Senate, instead of "until expended," as proposed by the House.

On No. 22: Appropriates \$100,000 for filling and grading the marshlands of the United States military reservation at Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 23 and 24, relating to barracks and quarters: Appropriates \$27,000 for the purchase of land at Camp Marfa, Tex., as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 25 and 26, relating to water and sewers at military posts: Divides the sum made immediately available as between the procurement of fuel and the installation of pipe line at Fort Frank, P. I., as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 27: Appropriates \$81,223 for engineer operations in the field, as proposed by the House, instead of \$96,223, as proposed by the Senate, and transfers the matter proposed by the Senate with respect to the survey of battlefields to take the place of the matter stricken out by the Senate by amendment No. 42.

On No. 28: Appropriates \$118,500 for seacoast defenses, insular possessions, Chief of Coast Artillery, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 29 to 33, inclusive, relating to the National Guard: Appropriates \$10,192,000 for field and supplemental training, including construction at camps, instead of \$9,952,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,302,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$375,000 on account of military service schools, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$350,000 for travel of regular service personnel, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$341,000, as proposed by the House; and appropriates \$425,000 for expenses of enlisted men of Regular Army, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$448,720, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 35 and 36, relating to arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, National Guard: Improves the text, as proposed by the Senate and appropriates \$4,512,280, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,762,280, as proposed by the House.

On No. 37: Appropriates \$858,100 for headquarters and camps, Organized Reserves, instead of \$981,729, as proposed by the Senate, and \$758,100, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 38 and 39: Restores the proposal of the House that commutation in lieu of uniforms paid to members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall not exceed \$7.15, including renovating costs, and appropriates, pursuant, \$2,645,914, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,821,914, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 40: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the authorization to use not exceeding \$500 of the appropriation for military supplies and equipment for schools and colleges, for supplying uniforms and uniform material to worthy military units at educational institutions not affiliated with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

On No. 41: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the authorization to use \$10,000 of the appropriation for headstones for marking the burial place at Washington Crossing Park, Pa., of soldiers of the Revolutionary War, and appropriates for furnishing headstones \$235,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House.

On No. 42: Appropriates \$15,000 for making surveys, etc., of battle fields, in accordance with the act approved June 11, 1926, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House, and \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for making such surveys of Kings Mountain and Cowpens battle fields only.

On No. 43: Appropriates \$1,000,000 on account of construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska, instead of \$700,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,060,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 44: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, with certain modifications designed to improve the text, the use of \$150,000 of the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River, for making certain improvements at Vicksburg, Miss., with the view to the permanent establishment at that point of an interchange terminal between railways and vessels of the Inland Waterway Corporation.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments:

On No. 1, relating to advance payments by military attachés.

On No. 34, relating to the interchange of National Guard appropriations.

HENRY E. BARBOUR,
FRANK CLAGUE,
L. J. DICKINSON,
BEN JOHNSON,
T. W. HARRISON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the conference report, the bill as it passed the House carried total appropriations of \$357,938,518. As passed by the Senate the bill carried \$360,503,449.50. This represented an increase in the Senate of \$2,564,931, exclusive, however, of \$945,000 of reappropriations. The total Budget estimates for the War Department appropriations for the year 1928 were \$360,008,797. The bill now carries a total, as agreed to by the conferees, of \$359,781,729, and reappropriations of \$4,445,000, or in all \$364,226,729. The total of direct appropriations carried in the bill is \$227,068 less than the Budget estimates.

The Senate increased several of the items in the House bill. The principal increases were in connection with the maintenance of an Army of 118,750 men. After the House passed the bill it was found that the estimates submitted by the War Department were not sufficient to maintain an Army of that strength, and supplemental estimates were submitted. Most of the increases which relate to the strength of the Army are fortified by supplemental estimates of the Bureau of the Budget. Among the principal changes in the House bill, aside from those relating to the strength of the Army, are the sum of \$100,000, added by the Senate for the draining of certain swamp lands owned by the Federal Government near Fort DeRussy, in the Hawaiian Islands, and \$27,000, added by the Senate for the purchase of land at Camp Marfa, Tex. This purchase was not authorized by law at the time the bill passed the House, but since that time an authorization has been passed, and by the time the bill reached the Senate this appropriation was authorized by law. The Senate incorporated this amendment for \$27,000, and the House conferees have agreed to it.

As to the National Guard, there is a slight increase of \$280, but there has been a readjustment of \$250,000 in the funds carried in the House bill for the National Guard. Certain funds have been taken from some activities of the National Guard and transferred to other activities, so that the total increase amounts to only \$280. The Senate had proposed an increase of \$110,000 for National Guard activities, but the Senate conferees have receded as to that increase.

The House bill carried an appropriation of \$3,000 for a survey of two Revolutionary battle fields, Kings Mountain and Cowpens. When the bill reached the Senate this item was stricken out. Later an amendment was presented on the floor of the Senate and adopted, which provided \$15,000 for surveys of battle fields, but mentioned no particular battle field, leaving the selection of the battle fields to be surveyed to the discretion of the Secretary of War. The bill, as it now comes before the House on the report of the conferees, instead of carrying \$3,000 for two battle fields, carries \$15,000 which is generally applicable to the survey of battle fields as selected by the Secretary of War.

The sum of \$360,000 was added by the Senate for construction of roads and trails in Alaska. The conferees have agreed to an increase of \$300,000. The Budget estimate called for \$500,000. This was increased by the House to \$700,000, and the bill now carries \$300,000 more.

Mr. SNELL. That means that there is a million dollars of appropriation in that one item?

Mr. BARBOUR. One million dollars in the Alaskan item for roads and trails and bridges. Those are the principal changes made in the House bill. There is, however, one other change in which some Members of the House may be interested. That is the amount carried for the purchase of headstones for the veterans of all wars. The House increased this item to \$206,000, but even with the House increase it was found that there would be a shortage in the number of headstones to be supplied by the end of the fiscal year 1928. In order to take up that shortage and bring the supply of headstones up to the demand, so far as it is possible to estimate the demand during the fiscal year 1928, the sum of \$25,000 was added to the bill. There is also the sum of \$10,000 which the House bill carried for a monument at Washington Crossing Park, which is the point at which Washington started when he crossed the Delaware. That has been changed by a Senate amendment, and the \$10,000 added to the \$25,000 makes an additional amount of \$35,000 for headstones. The information that we have is to the effect that this will supply all of the headstones for which requests will be received up to the end of the fiscal year 1928.

There are two amendments as to which the Senate and the House are in disagreement.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman goes to that, will he yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The gentleman suggested that there was an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for roads and trails and bridges in Alaska.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I remember some items for roads that were before this House in connection with one of the appropriation bills. I think it was the Interior Department bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is the railroad, I think, that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SNELL. That is another proposition.

Mr. BARBOUR. The Alaska Railroad is under the Interior Department and the roads and bridges and trails in Alaska are under the War Department, while there are certain roads in the forest reserves which are under the Agricultural Department.

Mr. BACON. The bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL] refers to was the authorization bill. I was present on the floor when it came up.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. That may be true, but the question in my mind was, Why should the appropriations for the various kinds of roads be scattered through the bills providing for three different departments of the Government?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is the same with respect to continental United States. Military roads come under the War Department, other roads come under the Agricultural Department, and roads in national parks come under the Interior Department. It all depends on the character of the roads and where located.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in regard to another amendment?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. As to No. 44. The statement as made is, "authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, with certain modifications designed to improve the text," and so forth. And then reference is made to the use of \$150,000 of the appropriation for flood control of the Mississippi River for making certain improvements at Vicksburg, Miss., with a view to the permanent establishment at that point of an interchange terminal between the railways and the vessels of the Inland Waterway Commission. The amendment itself does not absolutely square with the statement, or at any rate it is more specific. The amendment reads:

Of which the Secretary of War may authorize the Chief of Engineers to expend not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of riprapping the bank and channel matressing the river at Vicksburg, Miss., at such a point and in such a manner as may be necessary to make the permanent establishment of an interchange terminal at that point between rail and water feasible.

What is the idea of the expenditure of this \$150,000? Is it to build any part of the terminal, or is it merely to prepare the river by riprapping and otherwise so that the terminal can be constructed by the railways and the Inland Waterway Commission? I would think it going far afield to make an appropriation in this bill for the building of a terminal.

Mr. BARBOUR. The amendment reads that the \$150,000 is "for the purpose of riprapping the bank and channel matressing the river at Vicksburg, Miss., at such a point and in such a manner as may be necessary to make the permanent establishment of an interchange terminal at that point between rail and water feasible."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We have not a copy of the conference report. Is this in the conference report?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. And it is in the printed bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This is not one of the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. The information that came to the conferees was to the effect that the Mississippi River channel is changing at this particular point at Vicksburg, where the terminal is located and is endangering the terminal.

Mr. BURTON. Was there any hearing from the Chief of Engineers or anyone from the War Department?

Mr. BARBOUR. This comes under the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. This terminal, I will say, was built upon a site selected for the Inland Waterways Corporation soon after it started in operation, and the Government has some \$650,000 invested in it. As the gentleman from Ohio suggests, it would be improper to authorize the commission to use that amount for the building of the terminal, but the waterways corporation has expended about \$650,000 to build the terminal, which is about to be lost due to change of the channel. What the commission asked to do is make this channel secure as a foundation for the terminal.

Mr. BURTON. Then the terminal has already been constructed?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; the terminal has already been constructed, and is about to go away on account of the change of the channel of the river undermining its foundation.

Mr. BURTON. Is this on the main river?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. And this improvement would be part of the natural and proper work of riprapping and channel matressing the channel of the river?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes. Last year this same thing came up, and they asked for \$25,000, and it was opposed at that time. The commission made a survey, and this \$150,000 is the estimate of what it would cost. On account of the waterway transportation it was thought when the Senate put the amendment in that it should remain in order to make this channel permanent.

Mr. BURTON. Was this recommended by the commission?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No. The first amendment was prepared by the Secretary of War. When the committee got through, of course, it was in the form in which it is now. At that time it was thought it would come out of the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for rivers and harbors, but it was pointed out that the channel was under the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. BURTON. There has been no unfavorable report from the Mississippi River Commission on it?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. The Mississippi River Commission, as I understand it, took the position that it was not necessary in order to keep the channel of the river open, and it was not necessary for flood control; but inasmuch as the waterways corporation has made such progress and this terminal is so important, and it is the only one owned by the Government, which has this large investment in it, we felt that the opinion of the Secretary about it was correct, and that it ought to be suggested to the commission that this improvement be made.

Mr. BURTON. I shall not offer objection to it, but it does seem to me to be a little doubtful.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. There was some doubt in our own minds. We are particularly interested in flood control. But this being a peculiar situation, we felt that there should be some exception there, and it is due to the change of the channel of the river. If you were to say that this is necessary to keep the channel of the river open, I would say it is not necessary, but in order to effect this interchange of rail and water traffic and maintain the channel at this point for that purpose, it is necessary.

Mr. COLLIER. It does not increase the appropriation. It comes out of the \$10,000,000. It does not increase the amount due to the building of levees.

Mr. BURTON. Of course, it diverts that much for another purpose.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: Page 6, after line 12, insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall apply neither to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals nor to other payments made from appropriations contained in this act in compliance with the laws of foreign countries under which the military attachés are required to operate."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the effect of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes?

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me explain the purpose of the amendment and then I think that will follow. This language was included in the House bill but went out on a point of order. The purpose of it is to allow our foreign military attachés to buy periodicals and magazines and pay the subscription prices therefor in advance. I am told it is customary in some foreign countries to require payment in advance and this permits them to buy the periodicals and magazines they feel they must have and make payment in advance.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This does not in any way curtail any authority which they now have to procure periodicals in foreign countries?

Mr. BARBOUR. Not at all. On the contrary, it aids them in securing such periodicals and magazines.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But sometimes in granting a privilege we also include a limitation. There is no limitation in this amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. This is not a limitation. If this authority were not granted they would have to advertise.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am in perfect accord with the amendment.

Mr. BARBOUR. Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes provides for advertising. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 67, after line 1, insert: "When approved by the Secretary of War 10 per cent of each of the foregoing amounts under the appropriation for 'Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard' shall be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named, but no one item shall be increased by more than 10 per cent: *Provided*, That a report of amounts so transferred between appropriations shall be submitted to the Congress at the first regular session after the close of the fiscal year 1928."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 16576) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a conference report which the Clerk will report, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statements:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16576) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That traveling expenses of the commission or Secretary shall be allowed in accordance with the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$3,091,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of

the sum proposed insert: "\$435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$810,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$2,519,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendment numbered 13.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
ERNEST R. ACKERMAN,
W. B. OLIVER,
ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
REED SMOOT,
FREDERICK HALE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16576) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to ambassadors and ministers: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing for ministers to the Dominion of Canada and the Irish Free State and appropriates \$631,500, as provided for by the Senate, instead of \$611,500, as provided by the House.

On No. 5, relating to clerks at embassies and legations: Appropriates \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$365,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 6 and 7, relating to contingent expenses, foreign missions: Appropriates \$784,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$762,500, as proposed by the House; and provides reimbursement, as proposed by the Senate, to Lao Lang Hui, interpreter.

On No. 8: Appropriates \$2,930,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,925,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries of foreign-service officers.

On No. 9: Strikes out the language, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts the language, as proposed by the House, relating to traveling expenses of the Canadian Boundary Commission.

On No. 10: Inserts the language, as proposed by the Senate, making \$5,000 immediately available for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada.

On No. 11: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate, appropriating \$75,000 for the Sixth International Conference of American States at Habana, Cuba.

On No. 12: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate and inserts the language as proposed by the House, amended so as to provide that traveling expenses shall be allowed for the International Joint Commission.

On No. 14: Appropriates \$1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,175,000, as proposed by the House, for regular assistants to United States district attorneys.

On No. 15: Appropriates \$30,000, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the expenses of the probation system, United States courts.

On Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, relating to aircraft in commerce: Appropriates \$150,000, instead of \$165,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$136,230, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the District of Columbia; provides for 10 airplanes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 5, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$700,000, instead of \$796,250, as proposed by the Senate, and \$556,390, as proposed by the House, for ex-

penses of aircraft in commerce; and makes \$168,000 immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$111,500, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 20 and 21, relating to air-navigation facilities: Appropriates \$3,091,500, instead of \$3,219,500, as proposed by the Senate, and \$3,011,775, as proposed by the House, for air-navigation facilities; and makes \$450,000 immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 22, 23, 24, and 25, relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Inserts the language, as proposed by the Senate, limiting expenditures to \$77,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates \$435,000, instead of \$515,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$395,000, as proposed by the House, for District and cooperative service, and makes \$20,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$19,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$810,440, instead of \$825,440, as proposed by the Senate, and \$770,440, as proposed by the House, for export industries.

On No. 26: Appropriates \$9,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,200, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with standardization work in the Bureau of Standards.

On No. 27, inserts the language proposed by the Senate making appropriation of \$30,000 for fish-cultural station at Leadville, Colo., available during the fiscal year 1928.

On Nos. 28 and 29, relating to the Alaska General Service: Appropriates \$332,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$322,000, as proposed by the House, for the Alaska General Service; and makes \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30,000, as proposed by the House, available for road construction work in Alaska.

On No. 30: Appropriates \$2,519,060 instead of \$2,549,060, as proposed by the Senate, and \$2,489,060, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the Patent Office.

On Nos. 31 and 32, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$194,960, as proposed by the House, for economics of mineral industries; and corrects a total in the bill.

On No. 33, inserts the language, as proposed by the Senate, appropriating \$1,090,076, for carrying out the provisions of the maternity and infancy act.

The committee of conference have not agreed to the following amendment of the Senate:

On No. 13, preventing the use of any money appropriated for the enforcement of antitrust laws, for use in the prosecution of farm and labor organizations.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
ERNEST R. ACKERMAN,
W. B. OLIVER,
ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and the judiciary, Commerce, and Labor, as it passed the House, carried \$83,525,390.91; as it passed the Senate it carried \$85,545,991.91; that was an increase of \$799,625. The bill as agreed to in conference carries \$85,176,741.91, which is only \$33,560 over the Budget estimate. The various increases were, first, \$57,500 to take care of two items in the Department of State, providing for the pay of our ministers to the Irish Free State and Canada, and additional contingent expenses and clerks. That is an item which came to us from the Bureau of the Budget. There is also an item of \$75,000 for the Sixth International Conference of American States. It will be remembered that this organization really antedates the Pan American Union; it was established in 1890. It has meetings at regular intervals, as nearly as possible, but interrupted during the war. However, they usually have a meeting every five years. The next meeting is to be held at Habana and this appropriation is to take care of that meeting. We have also consented to an increase of \$30,000 for probation officers in the Department of Justice. We increased the appropriation made by the House for the aircraft program by \$223,000. We increased the item for district and cooperative offices in the Department of Commerce by \$40,000. We increased the item for export industries by \$40,000. We increased the Patent Office by \$30,000 and the Bureau of Mines by \$32,000. We have also carried a supplemental estimate made by the Bureau of the Budget of \$1,252,000 to take care of the maternity act. We were not able to consider that item at the time the bill came before the House because the extension had not been allowed by Congress.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I notice that \$50,000 was put in the bill for probation officers, to which the gentleman has just referred. In accordance with the statement that was made on the floor of the House there appeared to be almost unanimity of opinion among the United States judges that the appropriation was unnecessary. Were there any additional facts developed in the Senate to support this expenditure?

Mr. SHREVE. There were. The facts are that this item was probably not properly presented to our committee. However, we only allowed \$30,000 in the conference report. From the best authority we could get it was deemed advisable to carry it along in a small way for a while.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman about the appropriation for assistant United States district attorneys. I notice that appropriation has been cut down from the figure carried in the House bill, and the gentleman will recall there was quite a discussion about that during the debate in the House.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; I recall. However, when we got into conference and considered the matter very carefully, we receded and allowed the \$25,000 additional to stay in the bill.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. CHALMERS. As I understand it, you have put in \$25,000 more than was in the House bill?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman about another item in the bill. When the bill passed the House I was assured by one of the members of the committee that the appropriation had been increased \$7,500 for certain publications in the Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor, for instance, the publication *Care of the Infant*. I am told by the Secretary that the amount was increased only \$5,000 instead of \$7,500, and that they did not have enough money to care for this publication. This is a very valuable publication and is an important educational document, and I was hopeful I could supply the needs of my district with this book. I have been informed by the Department of Labor that they can let me have only one-third of the demand.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that he can do that. We appropriated the \$5,000 and there is another \$2,500 which is available. They had an original allotment of \$2,500, and I am sure the gentleman will have all the service he needs in this connection.

Mr. CHALMERS. I thank the gentleman. That is just what I wanted to know.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS. I notice that the Senate increased certain appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The gentleman will recall that when the bill was before the House it was stated there was an understanding with the Department of Commerce and with this bureau that the money appropriated would not be used unduly for any particular industry, but that all industries would be given a fair opportunity by the bureau. I want to say that this agreement was due in large measure to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. The gentleman knows I am particularly interested in tobacco, and I am anxious, of course, to see that nothing shall be done which will prevent the bureau from giving tobacco that attention which it promised to give when it was before the gentleman's committee. I am also interested in other industries. I do not think the appropriation should be used exclusively or largely for one industry at the expense of another, and I want to ask the gentleman if there has been any change in the attitude of the bureau with respect to this particular amount appropriated particularly for the export industry?

Mr. SHREVE. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, I wish to say there has been no change in the policy, and there will be no change. It is not the policy of this committee to designate any particular locality or any particular item which shall be handled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. We make our appropriations in lump sums. Of course, in a preliminary way we have some assurance from the department as to how the money is to be used. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], I am sure, will concur in what I have said about this.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; and I might add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said that the Bureau of the Budget had its attention called to the fact that in some of the estimates sent up it had marked, we might say, a definite amount for certain things, and we discarded that and notified

the Bureau of the Budget we would not approve an estimate in that form, and it has been so understood by our committee, and we notified the Senate conferees to the same effect, and we have notified the Department of Commerce that this is a fund that is to be equitably allotted to these different industries that were mentioned before the committee, and I am sure that will be done.

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNS. And the gentleman is of the opinion that all these industries will be taken care of?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably so.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that is correct.

I move the previous question on the conference report, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 37, line 11, insert: "Provided, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof not in itself unlawful: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, this item has been carried in the bill for several years, but went out on a point of order when the bill was considered by the House. The Senate put the item back in the bill, and we have no objection to it. I therefore move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION IN THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION TO CONSIDER QUESTIONS OF REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 423.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 352, to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the House joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the House joint resolution, the House joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the House joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the House joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the House joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he desires any time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire about two minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution and the one to be called up following providing for an arboretum were both reported out of the Committee on Rules by unanimous consent. I thought it proper to say that, although there is no opposition to it on this side of the House at least.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this rule simply provides for the consideration of House Resolution 352 which has for its purpose providing for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments. I simply want to say at this time that in January, 1926, we made the preliminary authorization of \$50,000 to pay the expenses of that commission. That work has been going on from time to time through subcommittees. As I understand, the subcommittees have completed the work and are ready to report to the full committee. It has been the policy of our Government to do everything we could to favor the limitation of armaments and general peace among nations. It would probably be a mistake if we withdrew at this time. This resolution simply authorizes \$75,000 more to pay the expenses of the commission. It is expected that the commission will be busy for several months. I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I trust this resolution will be adopted without opposition. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has stated, it has the unanimous indorsement of the Committee on Rules, and I may say also that it has the unanimous indorsement of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I regard this time to be opportune to speak at some length on the relations of the United States Government to the League of Nations, because several propositions of a nature similar to this are pending.

First. The United States Government rejected membership in the League of Nations, and I take it for the present at least that may be set down as the policy of this Government.

Second. Under the protocol for the creation of the Court of International Justice the United States was eligible for membership. By a resolution of this House passed by 301 to 28 approval was given to our membership in that court. The question of adherence was taken up by the Senate and two reservations were affixed, one that the United States might have leave to withdraw, and the other that no advisory opinion should be rendered by the court in which the United States had, or claimed to have, an interest.

To this last reservation, especially, objection was made by other nations, members of the court. I take it for the present we can not expect to have membership in that tribunal. Quite a number of persons have expressed their recantation or repentance for having favored our membership in that court. With them I have no sympathy.

I very much regret that a situation has arisen under which we can not be counted as participants in that body. I trust that in the future by further negotiations the way may be paved so that we shall take part in that august tribunal.

Of course, I am for the acts of our own Government; I stand by that always. But I do wish for a minute to dwell on the reservation voted by the Senate, that no advisory opinion should be rendered on a subject in which the United States has or claims to have an interest.

Now, let us for the sake of absolute fairness put ourselves in the place of the other nations members of that court. The rendering of these advisory opinions has been a very important feature of the jurisdiction of that tribunal. Many perplexing questions have been settled by its decisions in which there has been very general acquiescence. There has been no criticism of the fairness or the ability of the court.

But it is proposed by this reservation that if we claimed to have an interest in any question that is presented the court may not consider it. Then if there is a dispute between Germany and France, or between Italy and Yugoslavia, if we claimed an interest, that court could not take up the question and pass upon it. Suppose, for instance, there was an administration here unfriendly to our membership in the World Court, or a Secretary of State, or a Senate, or a Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and they desired not to promote the jurisdiction of that body, but to hamper it.

The result might be that in any case where any advisory opinion was asked they would say, "We claim to have an interest in it," and the question presents itself to us, Is it quite fair for us to reserve the right to destroy that very important branch of the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What does the gentleman understand to be the extent and binding force of an advisory opinion? Does it go any further than to give advice?

Mr. BURTON. Practically not, although they have been accepted in perhaps all cases. There is one exception where one country demurred, but the decision was nevertheless accepted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has it any binding effect such as an opinion would have in a common-law court?

Mr. BURTON. It has at least a moral effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman understand that the advisory opinion is analogous to other opinions that the court might render?

Mr. BURTON. Not of the same rank.

Mr. COLE. Are the advisory opinions rendered for any nation singly or in groups, or are they always rendered to the League of Nations?

Mr. BURTON. I can not answer that question directly. It is expected that it be on the request of two nations or more. It is filed with the League of Nations. The question of where it is filed, however, does not assume any special significance.

Mr. COLE. Do we understand the gentleman to mean that all we have to do is to set up a claim of interest in a question submitted?

Mr. BURTON. That is the language of the reservation.

Mr. COLE. Would it not be necessary for us to prove that we had an interest?

Mr. BURTON. That the gentleman can interpret for himself. The plain, distinct language of the reservation is "Has or claims to have an interest."

Mr. COLE. Might they not call on us to show that we did have an interest?

Mr. BURTON. That would be a question of interpretation. Mr. Speaker, there are two points of contact between the League of Nations and the United States Government which may be roughly divided under the names of conferences and commissions or committees. When we enter into a conference our delegates have plenipotentiary powers to sign treaties, the same as would be possessed by our Secretary of State or a duly accredited ambassador. We have been members of two of these conferences; first, the so-called opium conference at Geneva in 1924 and 1925, which resulted unfavorably, our delegates withdrawing; though I think the conference was not without beneficial results; second, the conference for the international control of the traffic in arms, which sat for seven weeks at Geneva in May and June, 1925. I can speak of that second conference from the standpoint of membership. The utmost deference was paid to every contention of the American delegation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, not a single provision was inserted in any treaty to which the delegates from the United States objected. We were also in a very favorable position, because on some controverted subjects between various other nations we had no special interest and were relied upon to take the position of arbiters, so that I may say our membership in that conference was extremely gratifying to those who took part in it.

I very much regret to say that the Senate had failed to advise and consent to the treaty for control of international traffic in arms, and also is holding up the treaty for prohibition of the use of poisonous gas in warfare.

In addition to these two conferences we have accepted membership or representation on several committees or commissions. These differ from conferences in that the delegates are limited to recommendations. For example, the Surgeon General of the United States was a member of the international health commission at Paris. The League of Nations for its commission on health selects certain members of this body that centers at Paris for membership upon a similar commission in the League of Nations. Our Surgeon General has been chosen as one of these. He goes, not to bind the United States in any agreement, but to participate in their discussions and make suggestions. There is another advisory committee at Geneva for the protection of women and children. Miss Grace Abbott has attended several of the sessions of this advisory committee, having been designated for that purpose by the Department of Labor, without legislation. There was also a conference in regard to the control of obscene literature, and a representative of our Government attended that conference, but did not sign a proposed agreement. That agreement has been submitted to our State Department, however, and is now pending before the Senate. A committee of experts on double taxation has been called by the League of Nations. For membership in that, Prof. Thomas S. Adams, who has had an important part here at the Capitol in framing revenue laws, is our delegate, and he will attend that in May. The committee met last year; but, as I am informed, Professor Adams, by reason of ill health, was not able to go. There is also an international economic conference under the auspices of the League of Nations. For the sending of delegates to this conference, which I believe reconvenes in May, an appropriation is proposed of \$15,000, on which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE] has filed a report; and, as I understand, intends to bring it before the House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. COLE. I would say that the Speaker has agreed to recognize me to-morrow to call it up.

Mr. BURTON. The appropriation proposed is \$15,000.

I now come to this preliminary commission, under consideration before the House to-day, to present an agenda to the conference, to be held at a later date, for the limitation of armaments among nations. Such a limitation is distinctly forecast in one of the articles of the League of Nations covenant, and I want to say to you all that this assumes the very utmost importance. As I have repeatedly said to the House, if there is one growing need of the world, it is for peace. [Applause.] And every movement in the way of limiting armament on land,

on sea, or in the air, promotes that most beneficent object. We have at all times proclaimed our desire to do all that is possible in the way of limitation of armaments. We have reduced our own Army to a figure of less than 120,000 men, and I look with disfavor upon any increase in our Navy, although at the same time I believe it should be maintained at a high stage of efficiency.

I especially favor a bill pending here that provides for the elevation of guns, so that our battleships may be equal in gun power to the battleships of other nations. We should have a Navy which, man for man and gun for gun, will compare favorably with the navies of other nations and be sufficient for our needs.

The commission met at Geneva last summer. And I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that it is hardly correct to say that they came to conclusions. They were involved in a controversy between two conflicting schools of thought, as they are termed. For a very concise and adequate statement on that subject I would refer the Members of the House to a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitted on January 11 to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. PORTER] and included in the report on this resolution. Perhaps it is worth while that I should read from it. I read:

One school of thought, which is representative of the views of a group of governments chiefly situated within a limited area of the European Continent, may be generally indicated by five of its fundamental principles:

(1) That security must be guaranteed by some form of military assistance against aggression as a necessary condition precedent to the reduction and limitation of armaments.

That has been the contention of the French at every conference or convention that I have attended. I read further:

(2) That agreements for the reduction and limitation of armaments must be guaranteed by an international inspection and control of the military establishments to ascertain whether treaty obligations were being faithfully executed.

The idea of espionage upon other nations to ascertain if they are complying with their agreements is contrary to the fundamental principles of our diplomacy. When we make a treaty reliance for its performance must be on the honesty and good faith of other countries, and any system of spying upon them is offensive not only to their sensibilities but to the best principles of our diplomacy. I read further:

(3) That there exists a complete interdependence of armaments and that it is impossible to deal with any single category (land, sea, or air) without simultaneously dealing with the others.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman explain to the House that if the disarmament conference meets and we are a party to it whether their decision must be by unanimous vote? That is, whether one objection from a small nation out of fifty-odd nations attending the conference would be effective?

Mr. BURTON. The fundamental answer to that is that their decisions are not binding at all, and the objection of one or of a dozen would not be fatal to their reaching conclusions. It is expected that this preliminary commission should make a report, and then the conference would act upon it.

Mr. FISH. I mean when they make their report to the permanent conference when that meets must they have a unanimous vote to decide upon a limitation?

Mr. BURTON. No. The countries, some or all of them, would agree that, whether recommended by the commission or not, they would join in a treaty. Suppose there were 40 nations, and a treaty were framed by the conference, agreed upon by 30 nations, but to which 10 nations would not agree. Those 30 would join in a convention or treaty, and it would not be binding on those outside.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Would it be binding on the 30?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. Of course, the mere signature by our plenipotentiaries is not binding upon the Senate.

Now, I regard it as impracticable to make a complete agreement upon all these measures as interdependent. That has been the opinion of our own Government in promoting commissions of this kind. For instance, in 1921-22 we called in only nine nations. The conference consisted of only that number, because we thought the complication, if 40 or more were assembled, would be too great. The time required for their coming together would be so considerable that the plan would be futile. Then we confined the agenda of the conference as far as regards promotion of disarmaments to naval limitations, and on consideration it was still further limited on naval limita-

tions to battleships, especially, although there was a treaty in regard to submarines. In other words, our idea has been to avoid complications, caused by wide differences of opinion, not to undertake too much. I read again:

(4) That it is not sufficient to deal with the actual peace-time armaments of nations, but that industrial, financial, economic, and other factors must be taken into account in any general scheme that may be drawn up.

For instance, certain nations put forward the idea at Geneva last summer that you must take into account all the factories, all the transportation; that you must even take into account the number that had technical ability; lawyers were mentioned; doctors were mentioned. I fear very much that so ambitious an inclusion as this would prevent any agreement. I read further:

(5) That any agreements on the limitation and reduction of armaments in order to be effective must be universal and that there must be a single standard system applicable to all countries of the world.

Well, it is a very large contract to gather together all the nations of the world to consider the proposition of peace or any other proposition. Now, there are certain ideas held by what is termed one school of thought, and if those contentions are enforced at Geneva, I fear very much that no conclusion will be reached. But let us try. The views of the United States will be received, I am sure, with the utmost respect; and I can hardly conceive that a commission will gather together there without accomplishing something or taking some steps of importance in promoting the peace of the world.

They can not do everything that is hoped. They can not do everything that has been suggested in the questionnaire put forward by the League of Nations, but their coming together for consultation and for recommendation to a conference next year must certainly be of utmost importance.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that if we should fail to make this additional appropriation our actions would be interpreted as meaning a repudiation of what we have already done in the direction of conferring with the League of Nations relative to this important matter?

Mr. BURTON. It would most decidedly. On that point I read from the closing paragraph of the letter written by the Secretary of State on January 11, and I can not express it better than in his words:

I feel very strongly that in view of our consistent advocacy of the limitation and reduction of armaments we can not withhold our full and cordial cooperation in any effort of this sort to explore the subject and facilitate a practical approach to the problem. Furthermore, I desire to point out, for your consideration, that if after participation in the work of the preparatory commission during the six months we now withdraw for lack of necessary funds, it would not be surprising if the inference were drawn in some quarters that we were not sincere in our advocacy of the limitation and reduction of armaments.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LAZARO. I fully agree with the gentleman in his statement that we should do all that lies within our power to agree to a limitation of armaments, but at the same time does not the gentleman believe we ought to be very careful not to let our Navy drop below the 5-5-3 agreement already made?

Mr. BURTON. I do not believe in keeping up the 5-5-3 proportion on cruisers and other things any more than I do that a man who has a certain allowance for expenses should feel he must necessarily spend all of his funds. [Applause.] It is a question of safety and national policy.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When the Interparliamentary Union met in this House there were resolutions passed along this line. Is this in accord with the tentative agreement that was had at that meeting?

Mr. BURTON. It is in the same line with their resolutions.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask whether this proposed appropriation is for the expenses of the delegates to the proposed disarmament conference suggested by the President or to continue our delegates at Geneva?

Mr. BURTON. It is for the purpose of continuing our delegates, although there may be some changes in the personnel. There are, I may say, probably 17, clerical force included, who will go, and \$75,000 is thought to be the amount necessary to

cover their expenses. Of course, if it is not all expended it will not be needed.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It does not contemplate the acceptance of any tentative program?

Mr. BURTON. Not at all. Nothing will be final at the meeting of the preliminary commission. It is all merely preliminary.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Is it not a fact that the last conference we had resulted in the United States scrapping ships and other countries scrapping blue prints?

Mr. BURTON. Well, I do not think so. That is one of those exaggerated expressions which has had some general circulation in the newspapers and elsewhere, but I do not believe that at all.

Mr. BOYLAN. I believe the facts show that we scrapped ships while they scrapped blue prints.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think so.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I wonder if the gentleman would care to state whether, in his opinion, the other powers have violated the spirit of the Washington disarmament conference in their construction programs?

Mr. BURTON. If I thought so, I would not say so here. I do not think so, though.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman has stated his views as to the question involved from his standpoint. Does not the gentleman think we ought to take into consideration also the dire need for work and for employment in the several national navy yards where the men are losing the opportunity for employment and bread and butter because of the lack of effort to keep up with the terms of the agreement we made?

Mr. BURTON. I think we ought to take into consideration the employment of all our people, whether in navy yards or factories. [Applause.] But let the gentleman bear in mind that the navy yards exist for the people and not the people for the navy yards. [Applause.]

Mr. KINDRED. But may I not suggest to the gentleman that when the guns begin to shoot the navy yards are necessary primarily and ought to be kept up at all times?

Mr. BURTON. I hope the gentleman will live many years yet and not hear any of the shooting he has spoken about. [Applause.]

Mr. KINDRED. I hope I may not, but can the gentleman assure me I will not?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, no; of course, I can not assure the gentleman of that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask leave to amend the resolution by making the time 40 minutes on a side. If we do not use all of the time, we can yield it back.

Mr. SNELL. I wish the gentleman would not ask that. We have another resolution to consider this afternoon, and I suggest that the gentleman can get more time when the bill is taken up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is only a matter of 10 minutes on a side.

Mr. SNELL. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes on the rule, rather than to have any trouble about it. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, there is not much I have to say on this rule or on the resolution. I am in favor, as I have always been, of an adequate Navy and a sufficient Army. I want to see the United States Navy well rounded out under the 5-5-3 treaty.

The object of this appropriation and the work to be done is best shown by a letter from the President, which I insert:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a message which I submitted to you on January 4, 1926, I recommended the appropriation of the sum of \$50,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the work of the "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, being a commission to prepare for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments." By House Joint Resolution 107, approved February 1, 1926, you authorized the appropriation of this amount.

The preparatory commission met at Geneva on May 18, 1926. Its work has continued, through plenary sessions and subcommittee meetings, since that date. The task of the commission's subcommittees, to which was delegated the detailed study of many of the problems presented to it, has virtually been completed, and it is planned to hold another plenary meeting of the commission, probably in March, to

consider the subcommittee reports. Although it is difficult to predict the exact duration of the forthcoming sessions, it can reasonably be assumed that they will continue over a period of some months. It is the avowed purpose of the preparatory commission at the forthcoming meetings to evolve a definite agenda for a conference for the reduction and limitation of armament, which is, of course, the end to which the deliberations of the preparatory commission are directed.

I believe that the preliminary work has been useful, and that there is good reason to hope for concrete results from further meetings. Our representatives have consistently endeavored to play a helpful part and to direct the attention of the commission to the possibility of practical accomplishment.

I believe that we should continue to give our full cooperation to the work of the preparatory commission with a view to bringing about, as quickly as possible, a final conference, at which further steps may be taken to reduce and limit armaments.

The policy of this Government to favor measures which hold out practical hopes for the limitation of armament is firmly established. By continuing our hearty cooperation in the preparatory work we shall be able to do our share in formulating an agenda for the final conference which will give promise of actual agreements for arms limitation.

The appropriation of \$50,000 already made for this work has been exhausted. I therefore recommend that there be authorized further appropriation of \$75,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the forthcoming activities of the preparatory commission. I recommend this sum because, when the commission undertakes the actual drafting of an agenda, it may be necessary to send a considerable number of American representatives to insure adequate representation in all phases of the work. Since the exact requirements can not be foreseen and will depend on developments, it appears wise to provide a sufficient appropriation to meet contingencies that may arise.

In relation to the form of the appropriation, the prices prevailing at Geneva and the nature of the responsibility devolving upon the members of the delegation make it important that their expenditures for subsistence be exempted from the restrictions imposed by existing law and be made discretionary with the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1927.

I feel with respect to this resolution that having entered into a conference with delegates from other nations under a previous resolution in a preliminary way, not for the limitation of armament but for the purpose of bringing the matter down to certain definite questions on disarmament, we should continue the work. The delegates to this preparatory commission do not have any power whatever to commit us in any way, shape, or form as to the limitation of armament. The particular object in view under this resolution is that a certain number of nations shall have delegates at this preparatory commission, including the United States of America, and that these delegates shall formulate certain questions into an agenda for future consideration by a commission on disarmament when called, if ever.

As I understand it, when our delegates last year went to Geneva they had not any real, definite idea as to what was to be done. They were there for sometime, and they formulated certain questions or certain subjects for discussion, which they thought ought to be considered, and I am told that this made a very deep impression upon the delegates from the other nations and that practically before the conference adjourned the delegates from the other nations had seen the wisdom of the questions which our delegates had submitted.

It is a very difficult proposition to formulate an agenda to bring out of this great mass of data on armament—world progress and national defense and all those things—just a few questions which ought to be considered. These delegates worked there for a long time, and they expended almost the entire \$50,000, and this is for the purpose of continuing the work of this preparatory commission. We must not quit the work so long as there is a chance to accomplish results.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a long time and I regard his judgment highly. Does the gentleman think there is the slightest possibility of arriving at any agreement at this conference over in Geneva?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would not like to answer that question. I am not sufficiently in touch with the situation. I understand the gentleman himself is really in closer touch with the matter than I am, because he had the two admirals who were delegates to the commission before his committee, who told him just what had or had not been done and exactly what had been

accomplished over there, if anything. We did not have any such testimony.

Mr. BRITTEN. The resolution, which is now being put through under a rule, of course will be adopted, but this appropriation of \$75,000 might just as well be dumped into Lake Michigan because it will not do the slightest bit of good. It is all right for a lot of idealists like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and I say this with all deference to the gentleman, whom I regard very highly—to favor peace conferences, but the gentleman has always been a small-Navy man, the gentleman has always voted for small naval appropriations, and the gentleman has always been in favor of loving sentiments for our neighbors, which, of course, is all right from an idealistic standpoint, but it does not work out. The time is not yet here when governments will love each other despite their different characteristics. This conference, to which we are about to send some delegates and for which we are about to appropriate \$75,000, is a farce and will wind up as a fizzle.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me say to the gentleman that we were told yesterday by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] that in expressing our ideas about the farm bill as to its being unsound economically or unconstitutional, a Member is simply expressing his own opinion. I take it that the gentleman from Illinois is expressing his own opinion and the gentleman from Maryland is expressing his opinion. If this commission does not do any more good than to allow us to meet the delegates from the other nations, if it does not do any more than to bring us in contact with these people from other nations so we can find out that the League of Nations has not horns, a long tail, or stingers or anything of that kind, it will do this country and the world \$75,000 worth of good. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. If our friend from Illinois were to be one of the delegates I would agree with him that this would be a waste of \$75,000 and that we ought to save it [laughter]; but thank God, he is not to be a delegate.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then I will move that the distinguished gentleman from Texas be nominated as one of the delegates to go over there.

Mr. BLANTON. And I would be the strongest man there for peace.

Mr. BRITTEN. If there is a pacifist in this House who will vote against military appropriations and against proper national defense, the gentleman from Texas is that one man.

Mr. BLANTON. I will vote with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] every time to save the country from this big Navy building business.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Does not the gentleman believe that the best way to promote peace and the most positive assurance of peace we can have is through reasonable preparedness at all times?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course, that is true.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman believe we got the little end of it at the conference on the limitation of armament here in Washington?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely so. I think everybody in this country who knows anything about the matter knows by this time that is true. We got fooled that time, but we will not be fooled again.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I recognize he is a big-navy man; but I want to say to him that he has never voted for any bigger navy than I have voted for.

Mr. BRITTEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have been on this floor in the past when that great colleague of mine, Fred Talbott, fought up and down these aisles to get one battleship, and I have helped him to get the Members in line and to tell them just how important it was. Nevertheless, being a big-navy man, as I am, I can see the benefit of this conference in the intermingling of delegates from all the nations of the world upon this question. Reviewing the vast calamities of the World War and the setback to civilization it is certainly our duty to prevent another war if possible.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. And while our good and dear old friend Judge Talbott was voting and working day and night for adequate national defense around here, the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. BURTON] was consistently voting against those very measures.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That may be true, but we must remember one other thing. It was not the Democratic Party that scrapped the armament of this country through the disarmament conference.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman surely does not believe, like our friend, the doctor from New York, that just because there are idle men in navy yards, the country must go on with a big naval program, just to keep those men employed? Why, if we do not need the naval armament, let us put the men from the navy yards out into other productions!

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman from New York does not believe any such thing. He believes in keeping the navy yards in proper condition.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think the question can be any better answered than it was answered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The navy yards are for the benefit of the people and not the people for the benefit of the navy yards.

Mr. BOYLAN. Is it not fair to say that the navy yards ought to be kept at work as well as to subsidize the farmers?

Mr. BLANTON. The farmers are feeding somebody.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am not in favor of subsidizing the farmers. I am opposed to all subsidies, viewing them as parasites upon the United States Treasury and injurious to the people's interests.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman from Maryland think that the navy yards are a substantial part of the national defense?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely so, and we ought always to keep them in perfect condition and ready for any emergency. [Applause.]

Mr. SNEEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 352, to provide for the expenses of participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 352

House joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments.

Resolved, etc., That in compliance with the recommendation of the President contained in his message of January 7, 1927, the sum of \$75,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of further participation by the United States in the work of the preparatory commission at Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of making preliminary studies and preparations for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments; and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including compensation of employees, travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act); and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "subsistence," insert "in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reach an agreement with the gentleman from Maryland as to the control of the time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to control one-half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Maryland opposed to the resolution?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; I do not think anybody is opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any member of the committee opposed to it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think that anybody is opposed to it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if no member of the committee is opposed to the resolution, will a Member of the House, not a member of the committee, be entitled to the half hour in opposition to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. That is the rule, but I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not claim that.

Mr. BRITTEN. Reserving the right to object, when a Member of the House publicly expresses his opposition to a bill appropriating \$75,000 to put into a ridiculous proposition, as was done last year when the representatives came back and said that they could not even agree on a formula to proceed with the work, some one ought to have the other side of this bill.

Mr. FISH. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes now.

Mr. BRITTEN. But, Mr. Chairman, I think members of the committee are entitled to first consideration, and I think the gentleman from Maryland should control half the time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] for half an hour and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] for the other half.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I want to read a letter that was delivered to me to-day from the Secretary of State:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 18, 1927.

The Hon. HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR Mr. FISH: I am exceedingly anxious that the bill appropriating \$75,000 to pay the expenses of our delegation to the Geneva conference should be passed at the earliest possible moment. The delegation will be sailing very soon now, and we have no funds out of which to pay their expenses. Furthermore, as you are aware, we are committed to this conference, having accepted the invitation a year ago. A delegation was appointed and attended the preliminary conference, which is to be resumed the 21st of March, and, of course, it would place this Government in an exceedingly embarrassing position not to be able to continue it. I am very anxious that you should expedite this matter as far as possible.

I am, my dear Mr. Fish,
Very sincerely yours,

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is this conference that we are appropriating money for the one we have been reading about in the public press that Italy and France are refusing to take part in?

Mr. FISH. It is partially so. I will explain that as we go along.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it under the League of Nations, or outside?

Mr. FISH. It was called by the League of Nations.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is this to be under the direction of the League of Nations, or is it outside of it?

Mr. FISH. It is outside of the league, but it was called by the league.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I notice that the objections the two nations make is that this Government has not recognized the League of Nations.

Mr. FISH. I will explain that. This resolution, providing for \$75,000 to send delegates to the preparatory commission, is not a new venture. We appropriated \$50,000 last year for the same purpose to send delegates to Geneva to attend the meetings of a preparatory commission.

The invitation was extended originally by the League of Nations, and the meetings of the preparatory commission are held at Geneva. Last year our delegates went over and attended the meetings of the preparatory commission and were assigned to the various subcommittees on the limitation and reduction of armament. Those committees met and considered the various subjects. Some made great progress and others did not make any, the idea being to reach a satisfactory basis to build up an agenda for the proposed conference on disarmament. We have not agreed to join that conference, and we do not have to decide until we know what the agenda is. The agenda is being gotten up by the preparatory commission, of which we are members, and this resolution continues the membership in the preparatory commission.

The new proposal of the President, to which the gentleman refers, is somewhat different. The preparatory commission

more or less decided that the question of limitation of armament should all be considered together—naval, military, and aircraft limitation—as one and inseparable. The President evidently believes that such a plan is not practical, and has suggested another solution, to the effect that the delegates of the five great naval powers, Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, and the United States, who have already been assigned to represent those countries on the preparatory commission, should meet and try to come to an arrangement between themselves on limitation of light cruisers, submarines, and destroyers.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The language used by the President in his message, and by the Secretary of State in his communication to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, indicates that while the place is the same and the personnel so far as we are concerned may be the same, yet that the conference that he proposes is independent of the conference described in this resolution.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit me to read one sentence from the letter of the Secretary of State that plainly appears. He says:

It was therefore considered desirable to convene the representatives of a limited number of States to conduct a preliminary survey of the general problems involved, and to draw up, if possible, an agenda, which could serve as a basis of discussion of a final conference.

Mr. PEERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. PEERY. How many nations will participate in that limited conference?

Mr. FISH. Only five nations were invited or suggested by the President to attend the proposed naval limitation conference at Geneva.

Mr. PEERY. And two of those have declined?

Mr. FISH. One has officially declined. I do not think that Italy has as yet.

Mr. PEERY. So that it will be a conference between the representatives of four nations?

Mr. FISH. If those four accept, yes. It is an extension of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will this preliminary conference of the five nations, suggested by the President, be held under the auspices of the League of Nations?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Or is it to be an entirely separate conference as independently called as was the Conference on Limitation of Armaments in Washington in 1921?

Mr. FISH. It depends upon what is meant by "under the auspices of the League of Nations." It is held under the auspices of the league, but it is not a part of the league. It does not come before the council and the assembly of the league, which constitutes the legislature of the league, but we were invited by the league originally, and therefore it is under the auspices of the League of Nations, although it is an entirely separate conference.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. To be held where?

Mr. FISH. At Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does not the gentleman think it is more essential for us to insist on the powers who were here at Washington coming back and settling that question instead of indulging in a lot of talk about these matters now, all of which are academic?

Mr. FISH. If this preparatory commission fails to reach a satisfactory basis for further limitation of naval armament, I hope very much that the President of the United States will call another conference in Washington for the further limitation of naval armament.

Mr. BLACK of New York. How does anybody ever expect to reach any agreement on this agenda? They will be there for the rest of their lives.

Mr. FISH. I admit that it will be very difficult, but it is not the fault of the United States. We are showing our good faith by appropriating money and sending delegates to participate. It is a matter of great regret that other countries insist that all armament shall be taken up and considered together. The United States has already reduced its Military Establishment down to 118,000 men.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Here is what I mean: We are going into another trap. We are going into this thing instead

of insisting that these powers who have violated the spirit of the Washington conference come down to terms and live up to that agreement. They are going to get us into this thing and talk us to death, and in the meantime build submarines and cruisers to their heart's content.

Mr. FISH. I can not agree with the gentleman on that. We are already committed to send delegates to the preparatory commission, and if it does not work out the way we hope it will, I think the President owes a duty then to call a conference over here for the further limitation of naval armament.

Mr. BLACK of New York. And he has a further duty, if he can not succeed in that, in building up our own Navy.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman in what he says to this extent: The passage of this resolution and the appropriation of \$75,000 will to a very large degree show the good faith of the United States in an attempt to limit armaments.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the gentleman, I take it, is willing to spend the \$75,000. It will go to establish an attitude of good faith, and I am inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. That is not quite the proposition.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is largely the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. FISH. I admit that one has to be an optimist to expect very satisfactory results, after what we have learned in the last few days. But we have no other recourse, we are committed to this proposition, and if we do not go through with it our good faith will be questioned and properly so.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think that is the crux of this resolution—the establishment of good faith in the desire to do a great work, and the United States now is ready to appropriate \$75,000 in what appears to many of us to be a lost cause, with a view to establish good faith.

Mr. FISH. That is correct. There is one thing that I can not agree with the gentleman about. I believe that the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament in 1921 and 1922 was the greatest achievement in the direction of peace since the armistice. I believe that the reduction of the Navy based on the 5-5-3 ratio did more to destroy overnight all thought and talk of war with Japan than anything else. Up to that time the papers were filled with jingoism, and numerous little things occurred prior to the Washington limitation of armament treaty which had a tendency to excite both Japan and the United States, and besides that treaty saved the United States of America \$250,000,000 a year by establishing a proportional ratio for reduction of capital ships.

I agree with the gentleman that the ratio should be kept up, and I intend to vote, very gladly, although I believe in a limitation of armaments, for three additional light cruisers, because I think that ratio should be maintained intact. [Applause.] And if necessary, I would vote for more than three additional cruisers if it were required to keep up the 5-5-3 ratio.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is in complete discord with his colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who says that he does not believe in the 5-5-3 ratio.

Mr. FISH. Certainly. The gentleman from Ohio has a right to his own view. I further say that by voting three additional cruisers, we do more than anything else to uphold the hands of our delegates in trying to get a further limitation on the other side, because if we go over there with simply paper guns and paper ships, they will laugh at us, and I am in the meanwhile for upholding the 5-5-3 ratio intact, in all its integrity. I am also in favor of further limitation of naval armament, and am going to say something with which I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] will not agree.

I go very much further than even the President does on the question of limitation of naval armaments. I see no reason in the world why we should not call a conference of the naval powers here in Washington and reduce proportionately again the ratio of capital ships. We would have practically the same protection if we reduced the number of capital ships on a proportional ratio from 18 to 9, if all the other nations did likewise. Why maintain 18 capital ships, costing millions and millions of dollars to operate, if we can get the same protection with 9 capital ships, providing that England and the other nations do likewise? Of course, I certainly would favor such further limitation of capital ships.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why not have the powers come together and maintain an agreement with England and Japan?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. We are quite sure that France will not come in, but it is very possible that America, Japan, and England, the three great naval powers, having more strength in battleships than all the others put together, might very well agree to reduce further.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman seriously contend that England would agree to a limitation of her naval armament with Japan and America without having some understanding with France?

Mr. FISH. I think they might all agree to further reduce their capital ships. France has few capital ships. But I do not think France would agree so far as submarines are concerned or that Great Britain would give up her preponderance of light cruisers; that is a different proposition.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman ever expect that Great Britain will reduce her light cruiser strength?

Mr. FISH. I think Great Britain might reduce a certain amount. She has something over 30 light cruisers. I think Great Britain might reach some agreement with Japan and the United States to limit the number of light cruisers.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman mean by that that Great Britain will scrap something that is now useless?

Mr. FISH. Yes. Mostly old cruisers of less than 10,000 tons. But what we want is to establish a ratio. The crux of the whole trouble is that if you do not establish a fixed ratio you enter competitive naval armament, and that is the one thing, more than anything else, that leads to war. That is the thing that started bad blood between Germany and England back in 1890. There was a very friendly feeling between the two countries before that, but as soon as Germany began to build a big navy that led to suspicion, distrust, and finally to war. All we can try to do is to reach a fixed ratio between the naval powers on auxiliary ships, and thereby to do away as far as possible with competitive armament.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman refers to a ratio as to the bigger ships?

Mr. FISH. The idea is to stop as far as possible competitive armaments in all classes of naval ships and prevent war.

Mr. BLACK of New York. The only hope of the United States is to send the farm bloc over there and bring back some of those ships.

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Reference has been made to other nations of the world not having kept faith with the Washington agreement. Most of the statements have been rumors, in my judgment. I am not strong on rumors, because we had plenty of false alarms during the war. Can the gentleman give us some definite information as to where they have violated their agreement with us?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. I am no expert on naval affairs, but speaking personally, I do not believe that any foreign nation has violated the spirit of the Washington treaty. I think the United States has failed itself to keep up with the 5-5-3 ratio, and I do not think any foreign nation has violated the agreement. I think they are entitled to build all the light cruisers, submarines, and destroyers they want under that agreement.

Mr. BRITTEN. My impression is that no nation has violated the Washington treaty. But continual reference is made to its violation in spirit, and by that is meant that it was generally construed that the 5-5-3 ratio on naval armaments as to all ships of war would prevail, whereas there is nothing like that in the treaty. When we refer to nations violating the treaty we mean the spirit of the treaty. The spirit of the treaty is that all warships shall be built on a ratio of 5-5-3. The other nations have gone ahead building light warships.

Mr. FISH. The limitation of light cruisers was not agreed to at the Washington conference nor was any agreement reached on destroyers and submarines, and there was no moral reason why any naval power should have stopped building as many as they wanted.

Mr. BRITTEN. We are in accord with that.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does not the gentleman think that the same conditions that prevented an agreement with regard to light cruisers and submarines exist to-day, and that all this expenditure of money would be just as useless now to attempt to limit the expenditure of money for those as it was five years ago?

Mr. FISH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The problem will never be solved as long as Gibraltar stands between Morocco and Marseille. An agreement exists that would prevent an agreement upon the part of Italy and France.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Would it not be much easier for us to solve our part of the problem if we would allay this clamor that is coming from the navy yards and from the shipbuilding interests and this and that other interest that want us to spend money for building more ships? Could we not solve our part of the problem more easily if we could get those conditions out of the way?

Mr. FISH. I do not know about that. I rather think we ought to keep up the ratio but reduce proportionately and show our willingness to reduce proportionately.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be very difficult for our delegates going over to this preparatory meeting, not only to reach any agreement to limit naval ships, in view of the attitude taken by France, but it is going to be perfectly impossible to reach any agreement to reduce the size of European armies, because one of the biggest countries in the world, having one of the biggest armies, has refused to enter that conference, and that is Russia. As long as Russia maintains its armies and refuses to limit those armies proportionately, of course, the rest of Europe—France, Italy, and other countries on the Continent—can not go ahead and reduce.

But, as far as we are concerned, we can at least say to them: We have already reduced our Army; we have done in a military way what the gentleman from Texas wants done in a naval way; we have reduced our Army to 118,000, which is practically a minimum for a country of 120,000,000, and, in addition, we can show to every nation in Europe a border line of 3,000 or 4,000 miles between Canada and the United States without a single fort and without a single gun.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If we will stop passing the Chinese trade acts for our friend from Missouri [Mr. DYER] and quit giving these special privileges to a few Chinese-American corporations by relieving them of income taxes and other responsibilities, and then having them expect our flag and our Navy and Army to protect them in China while enriching themselves off of those people over there, we would probably not need such a big Army and such a big Navy.

Mr. LINEBERGER. If we did that, we might as well build a Chinese wall around the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. No. I want an American Navy and an American Army for defense of Americans and not for foreigners.

Mr. FISH. Let us understand two things about this preparatory conference. The first is that the United States of America is willing to send its delegates over to Geneva hoping they can reach some satisfactory basis of limiting naval armament, and if possible military armament. That is the first thing. Let the American public understand that we intend to show our good faith, at least; and, in the second place, let the public understand that we have already reduced our Military Establishment and that we are not a party at all to the situation that arises in Europe to-day, where they believe they must maintain great armies.

I think it is a most pathetic thing that although eight years have elapsed since signing the armistice, yet the nations of the world have been unable to reach any agreement to limit military establishments. It almost seems they have forgotten that 10,000,000 men were slaughtered in the World War, that 5,000,000 more were maimed, and that billions of dollars of the savings of generations were consumed for destructive purposes. Yet, in spite of all that, we have not been able to do a thing with the rest of the world to persuade them to limit military establishments. We have been and are ready to co-operate to limit both naval and military armaments to help achieve and maintain world peace, but very little progress has been made. That is the most pathetic thing in our day and generation.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does the gentleman think America would have been in the World War at all if we had had a navy and an army adequate to defend our rights and command respect?

Mr. FISH. I think we had a pretty large Navy, and certainly the English Navy was large and adequate to handle the Germans until we entered the war.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I would like to have the gentleman answer that yes or no.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As I understand the gentleman's statement, it is that it is hopeless to expect any agreement as to cruisers, submarines, or destroyers.

Mr. FISH. Not altogether hopeless.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Well, it is pretty nearly hopeless.

Mr. FISH. It is a very difficult thing to work out.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman has also practically said it is hopeless and probably futile to continue the discussion as to a limitation of land armament. If that is so, what is the use of our continuing in a conference which has already demonstrated that its results will be futile? Why should we continue to spend money on a conference the inutility of which has already become entirely apparent?

Mr. FISH. Well, I will answer the gentleman from California first and then answer the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from California wanted to know whether if we had had great armaments that they would have prevented us from entering the war or practically having war declared on us. I will say in answer to the gentleman that every nation in Europe before the war was armed to the teeth, but that did not stop war. I believe that great armaments are the cause of war. [Applause.]

Now I want to answer the gentleman from New York by saying that we are already committed to this venture; we are a party to it; our delegates have been over there, and, as the Secretary of State pointed out, it would be a breach of faith if we did not continue and at least hope for the best and show we are willing to meet with the League of Nations, the preparatory commission, or the nations of Europe in trying to reach a satisfactory agreement to limit all kinds of armaments.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In other words, we are asked to make this appropriation in the spirit of hoping against hope?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman one other question. The defense of a nation, after all and most of all, depends upon its reserve strength and its reserve resources and possibilities, does it not?

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that we are better prepared for defensive purposes than we have ever been during the history of our country, except immediately after the Civil War. There is no question about that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I have only four minutes remaining.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will move to have the gentleman granted more time.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman can not do that. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that if we would stop granting credits and furnishing money to these powers to be used for military and naval armaments we could help the situation?

Mr. FISH. There may be something in that. That might prevent them from increasing their armament without regard to their budgets.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman has been very generous and I would like to ask him to yield for one more question.

Mr. FISH. I am sorry, but I have only three minutes left. There is only one time to make war on war and that is in time of peace. You can not do anything about it in time of war. It reminds me of that old story about the veteran who had a nagging wife. He took the first opportunity to get away from her when war was declared, so he left and went over with the first contingent of the A. E. F., but still these nagging letters followed him. Finally, after he received a particularly severe and nagging one he answered her letter and said, "Dear wife: Please let me fight this war in peace." [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, the time to fight war is in time of peace. There is no other time. If you try to fight it in time of war, you would probably land in jail and that is where you would belong.

We have the moral leadership of the world in our hands. Of course, it is our duty to cooperate with all the nations of the world in every effort and in every endeavor to limit naval armament, military armament, and all kinds of armament.

This is our duty as the biggest and richest and strongest Nation in the world; and in the remaining minute or so I want to put in the Record a statement that was given me to-day by the War Department which shows something of the ruthlessness and the increasing horror of modern warfare.

This is simply to show that the modern high-explosive shell causes a great many more deaths per wounded than they did in the old-fashioned war of 50 or 100 years ago. Fifty per cent of those killed in the World War were killed by shell fire; that is, they were killed by an unseen foe. The following is the percentage of wounded men who died as a result of their wounds: Civil War, wounded who died, Union Army, 28 per cent, Confederate Army, 30 per cent. Franco-Prussian War, Germans, 28 per cent, French 30 per cent. Russo-Japanese War—now notice the jump, because this is when the high-explosive shell was first used—Russians, 36.9 per cent, Japanese, 34 per cent. World War, French, 36 per cent; English, 36.6 per cent; Germans, 43 per cent.

This is the percentage of the men wounded who died as a result of their wounds and the reason is the development of the high-explosive shell, with its terrible steel splinters, and the machine gun. We certainly should use our great moral influence to do away as far as is humanly possible with "man's inhumanity to man." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this resolution complies with the request of the President conveyed to the House in January, I believe, for an additional appropriation of \$75,000 to cover the expenses of delegates to the disarmament preparatory commission which is being held or will be held soon at Geneva under the sponsorship of the League of Nations.

It will be remembered that we appropriated \$50,000 to cover the expenses of the delegates to the last session of this conference. It must be borne in mind that this commission is merely meeting for the purpose of preparing a program, or, as the diplomats say, an agenda for a conference which is to be later called to deal with the subject of disarmament.

On account of the declination of France to accede to the President's recent request regarding naval disarmament and to the predicted declination of Italy to join in that program, it is possible, and entirely probable, that whatever may be accomplished in behalf of disarmament will have to be accomplished at this conference that is being arranged at Geneva under the sponsorship of the League of Nations, because France has specifically declined to enter into an agreement other than the one which is being carried out under the direction of the League of Nations.

France takes the position that to have a separate and distinct agreement on naval disarmament, independent of the league's program for disarmament, would seriously embarrass the league's program and would weaken its influence. While the preparatory commission may not accomplish all that we may hope for, I believe, in the interest of international peace and good will, the United States can not do less than to appropriate these funds and send our delegates again to the League of Nations conference at Geneva.

I regret, however, that the President, in appointing our delegates to Geneva, appointed a predominantly military and naval commission rather than a civilian commission. It is true that Mr. Gibson, at present minister to Switzerland, is chairman of our delegation to the preparatory commission, but his staff is composed almost wholly of military and naval men. It is necessary, of course, to have military and naval experts on the staff, but most of us know there is not one military man or one naval man in ten who believes in any form of limitation of armament. [Applause.] The result is that we send a staff composed of these experts. They can not dissociate the problem from their preconceived notions about it. Mr. Gibson, while a civilian, will be so environed with this naval and military atmosphere that he will, of course, largely be dominated by their advice.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman think that these very experts are the best qualified to formulate these propositions for disarmament?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why, I will say to the gentleman that if they want to prepare a conference to really disarm and they believed in it, of course they would be; but if they do not believe in disarmament, if they have no sympathy with the idea, they are going to have some difficulty in disassociating their impressions from the practical features which will be necessary in order to disarm. In making these suggestions I am not impugning the motives or good faith or sincerity of gentlemen who represent us at the preparatory commission at Geneva.

What would gentlemen say in this House, for instance, if we should decide that we wanted to engage in a naval disarmament conference, and we should designate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] as the American delegate to this great naval conference for the limitation of armament? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. As a taxpayer of this great country, would the gentleman rather have the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Ohio, Senator BURTON, who is for no navy at all; as a matter of practical national defense, which would he rather have?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say to my friend that if I wanted the biggest navy in the world, regardless of any other government or any other nation or any other foreign country—as they used to say in reference to 16 to 1—I would want to send the gentleman from Illinois, because I know he would never agree to disarmament; but, on the other hand, if I wanted a conference that would make some progress toward real disarmament, real limitation of armament, I would send the gentleman from Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, the gentleman from Texas and I could go along for a week and not agree on what might be called an adequate Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Let me say that I have always voted with the gentleman for a big Navy. I am still for a big Navy, unless we can agree by treaty not to have a big Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. The President of the United States called for an incomparable great Navy, and I think the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Illinois has not been sufficiently observant of the attitude of the gentleman from Texas. On a number of occasions I have expressed myself by voting with the gentleman from Illinois against his own President in favor of additional cruisers; and the reason the gentleman from Texas voted that way is because until we do have some effective control over naval limitation and some effective limitation of armaments, the gentleman from Texas believes it is his duty, and the duty of Congress, to provide the country with a Navy sufficient to meet the greatest navy that floats, so far as it is possible under the present treaty.

Mr. BRITTEN. And I want the gentleman from Texas to feel that I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. I am not ignorant of that fact.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But the gentleman said that he could go along with me for a week and not agree.

Mr. BRITTEN. I said not agree on what was an adequate Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The trouble with the gentleman from Illinois is that while he is a great naval man, he has not sufficient influence with his own party or with his own President to adopt his policy, but he is pulling one way and the President is pulling the other all the time.

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, I think that statement made by the gentleman from Illinois as to the attitude of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is not correct. The gentleman from Ohio told us within an hour that he was in favor of an adequate Navy and was ready to vote for the elevation of the guns.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, the gentleman from Iowa is entirely mistaken.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Gentlemen, this is my time. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], while opposed to the league, advocates our sending delegates to the league conference. The President advocates going back to Geneva, to this conference under the league.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] such time as he may wish.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a good many of the questions that have been suggested here in the course of this discussion I have no idea of talking about. I have no idea at all of going into the question that was debated some weeks ago with reference to the construction of cruisers. This resolution proposes only one thing, and that is that our Government shall maintain contact with the League of Nations with respect to a single matter. We have declared heretofore that we think it wise to do that. All that is asked now is that the House shall carry out its original purpose by increasing the appropriation which will enable us to continue to do that. Personally I believe it is not only the duty of our Government, but it is to the interest of our Government to stand in a thoroughly sympathetic attitude toward the existing League of Nations and to do all that is possible without any sacrifice of our principles and views to support and foster the work that is being carried on by the league.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two very brief addresses recently delivered in New

York, one by the gentleman whom somebody has called the ablest man in America, Mr. Elihu Root, and the other by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, discussing the work and achievements of the League of Nations. They furnish enlightening information as to the processes and performances of the league and suggest the wisdom of the policy to which I have just alluded.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman further state that both these gentlemen are for the League of Nations and include that in his remarks?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. They are not now urging that our Government should enter the league.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Since when did they cease to do so?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is a difficult question to answer with reference to many gentlemen, and I do not think it is a profitable question to consider now. These eminent men are not saying that the United States should become a member of the league, but they are telling us what this Old World institution is doing.

Mr. LINEBERGER. They may not be advocating going in by the front door, as formerly; but they want to scratch in through the back door.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No; they are in favor of conferring with the league whenever the league is engaged in any effort which seems to make for the welfare of the world and the peace of the world. I shall do nothing more than quote one sentence from Mr. Root's speech, and it is a very remarkable utterance:

For these years [the past few years] the league in the political field and the court in the judicial field have been rendering the best service in the cause of peace known to the history of civilization—incomparably the best.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two addresses, one by the Hon. Elihu Root and the other by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the subject matter of Doctor Butler's address relate to the matter under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I insert the following addresses. I do this with no wish whatever to revive the old controversy as to whether our Government should become a member of the League of Nations, and without indorsing every expression contained in the addresses but for the purpose of showing the view of two very able and thoughtful men on one proposition, namely, that in the interest of the peace of the world it is most desirable that our Government, not sacrificing any of its own principles, should steadily give the League of Nations as now organized its avowed, sympathetic, and earnest support. I am no pacifist, in the common use of that term, but I have never been able to believe that there is anything so important as the avoidance of war, and I thoroughly agree with Mr. Root that the league is an incomparably useful agent in serving the cause of peace.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

An address by Mr. Elihu Root, former Secretary of State of the United States, in accepting the award of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation made to him in New York, December 28, 1926, "in recognition of his services to humanity and the cause of peace through justice in helping to create the Permanent Court of International Justice"

I beg you to believe that I deeply appreciate the honor that you do me. The finest thing about it is the spirit in which it is done, which is able to brush aside as incidental long political opposition and not a few differences of opinion publicly avowed, and to rest upon fundamental identity of purpose with a sense of proportion suitable to the high distinction of the great President whose memory you celebrate, and suitable to the deep and permanent purpose of your organization.

In foreign affairs it is peculiarly true that the spirit in which work is done is everything.

M. Briand in the Washington conference five years ago said, very wisely as well as very eloquently, that in Europe there must be moral disarmament before there could be physical disarmament, and ever since he has been applying to the disturbed conditions of Europe that sage philosophy, to his own immortal glory and to the great benefit of all mankind.

Nations always will differ. They differ in inherited characteristics and predilections and traditions and modes of thought and feeling. But there never is a difference so great that it can not be peaceably settled if approached in the right spirit.

And there never can be a difference so trifling that it may not be made the occasion of war if it is approached in the wrong spirit.

We are confronted by some difficulties in this respect in this country. We have long been a member of the community of nations, adjusting with our sister nations the rights and duties of members of that community by means of the diplomatic procedure which had grown up in the course of centuries—foreign offices and ambassadors and ministers and diplomatic notes and diplomatic memoranda and treaties and mediation and conciliation, etc. At the close of the Great War, when the greater part of the nations of the world united in the League of Nations, they entered upon a new mode of regulating their conduct with regard to each other and adjusting the differences that arise in the ordinary course of international affairs. Instead of using the old method, they proceed by formal conference of council and assembly, and a large part of the business which foreign offices and ambassadors used to do is now done through the machinery of the league. We have stood out of the league and are going on in the old ways, by the old methods, and the utmost friendly consideration is needed to reconcile the conduct of international affairs in the new way by our sister nations across the Atlantic and in the old way by ourselves. It is a very difficult thing to make a horse that trots and a horse that gallops pull evenly in the same team.

If the League of Nations had been formed against the United States the matter would be simple; but it was not formed against the United States; it was formed in friendship to the United States. It was formed in the expectation that we would be a member, and it was formed with the understanding, based upon the judgment of our representative, our negotiator, our agent, in the conference at Paris that it would be acceptable to the people of the United States.

We had a perfect right to refuse to enter into the treaty. Fair notice of that was given by the provisions of our Constitution. Nevertheless, President Wilson, when he went to Paris, was our representative; he was our negotiator; he was our agent; he was the only one to whom the nations of Europe could look to ascertain what would be satisfactory to the people of the United States. And when the league was completed, when we refused to become a member of it, Europe was left with an incomplete organization, left without the support of the most populous and richest and most powerful nation whose name was written into the covenant. When Europe was left with that incomplete organization to deal with the wild forces that were set loose by the readjustment of territory and of sovereignty under the treaty of Versailles, what would we naturally have said, what would any gentleman have said to another who had been brought into such an untoward condition by his representative and agent, mistaken, but in good faith? What but an expression of the most sincere regret? What but an expression of a confirmed intention and a strong desire to do everything possible to prevent our staying out of the league from being injurious to our old friends and associates?

What did we do? Has there ever been an exhibition by America of friendship or sympathy with the league and its work? Unfortunately, the controversy which resulted in our determining not to enter the league was violent, and bitter feelings were aroused. Those feelings came to be carried over to the league itself; and it came to be a common thing that we could read in the newspapers and hear in speeches and in conversation expressions of expectation that the league would fail, and evident pleasure when it seemed that it might fail. Those feelings were extended to the court which was presently created to cover another part of the field in the same effort to bring about permanent peace. Reprisals began to come from the other side. Unkind expressions never can be confined to one side. Reprisals began to come, disagreeable things were said upon the other side, and a period of pin pricks has proceeded for years. It has colored and conditioned the consideration of the debts between the foreign nations and ourselves.

That is not all. Not only did we forget the demands of honorable obligation resting upon old associations and fellowship and the expectations raised by our own representative; but consider the service that was rendered by the league and by the court. For these years the league in the political field and the court in the judicial field have been rendering the best service in the cause of peace known to the history of civilization—incomparably the best.

War results from a state of mind. These institutions have been teaching the people of Europe to think in terms of peace rather than in terms of war. They have been teaching them by actual practice, by things done, to think of oral conference instead of war about policies; to think of argument and proof and judicial judgment instead of war about rights; teaching them to acquire habits of thinking and of acting that way. The question of war or peace for the next generation is being settled now, to-day, by the character and the habits of thought and feeling, and the standards of conduct, which the people of the world are learning to-day to guide them in the exigencies of the future.

We, the great peace-loving people, what have we done to help in this wonderful new work? No sympathy, no moral support, no brotherhood. Our executive department has done the best it could, but gov-

ernments can do little. It is the people, the power of the people behind the government, that means everything.

We have allowed insensate prejudice, camouflaged by futile phrases, to appear, but falsely appear, to represent the true heart of the American people with all its idealism, with its breadth of human sympathy, with its strong desire that our country should do its share for peace and happiness and noble life in all the world. These are the qualities which save the soul of a nation rather than wealth and prosperity. But these qualities do not long survive disuse. The repercussions of our domestic strife seem to have prevented the effectiveness of our noblest impulses.

These, my friends, are some of the evils visited upon us by a hateful and contentious spirit; from which may the good Lord deliver us.

Address of Nicholas Murray Butler at the League of Nations Non-partisan Association dinner in celebration of the seventh birthday of the League of Nations, Monday, January 10, 1927, Hotel Astor, New York City

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my concern is for my country, for its good repute to-day and in history, for its influence and for its moral leadership in these great days of twentieth century democracy.

Toward the close of the summer holiday, I sat with an interested congregation in a little church by the sea and listened to a very striking sermon. Its opening sentences were somewhat like this: "The reason why Christianity no longer makes appeal to men is that they are too prosperous. They have discovered a new god, Comfort, and they are so concerned with worshipping him that they have no time for the God of their fathers." Then the preacher went on to say that the modern American ideal of life seemed to be to put a comfortable baby into a comfortable crib to be watched over by a comfortable nurse until it was able to go to a comfortable school; then to send it to a comfortable college, where comfortable teachers would see that it did not work too hard; to find its way into a comfortable profession, to marry a wife with a comfortable fortune; to spend 20 or 30 comfortable years, and finally to pass through a comfortable opiate to a comfortable grave. It was rather a striking picture, and not without its lessons for some of us.

As a people we seem just now not to be able to grasp the fact that it is given to us to stand at one of the turning points of human history and to watch the great procession of the ages as it changes its line of march and alters its objective. One wonders whether, when ancient Greece was passing, the leaders of Greek thought and letters knew that it was passing. When the Roman Empire was tottering to its fall, did the men of light and leading really understand that a stupendous change was going on? Did the men of the Renaissance have any conception of the period through which they lived and to which they made such powerful contribution? Did the political philosophers of England and France of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries realize that they were teaching ideas and thoughts that were to make a new political and social and economic world? Do we know—do we realize—that the long process of nation building that has been going on in the western world now for more than a thousand years has come to a substantial end, and that those nations—built many of them on strong and firm foundations, others still in the first flush of youth—are seeking, some of them in the darkness, for ways and means to clasp hands together to make a new form of human unity, of human cooperation, of expression of human effort, that shall destroy no nation but enrich them all?

He must be blind and deaf who can not see and hear the signs of the times. Locarno, from being only the name of a little town by a mountain lake, has become a significant symbol that will take its place in the long list of names that mark the progress of man's march, first toward liberty, then toward that fine and noble and lofty use of liberty which is human cooperation and international peace.

This is not the place, this is not the time, to recount details, many of which are so familiar to you all. But when we speak of Locarno we must never forget what three sterling personalities, three true leaders of men, did there for their countries and for the world, and what they did to place use all everlastingly in their debt. If you will let your mind run back 12 years to those dreadful days of 1914-15, does it not seem unthinkable that the ministers of foreign affairs of France and Germany and Great Britain should in that short time be sitting together around a table, talking as friends and comrades and companions, in a sincere and, thank God, a successful effort to bring their nations into association and into harmony?

M. Briand is easily one of the most remarkable personalities of our time, if not the most remarkable. You must remember that France and Germany, and even Great Britain, have their stoutly recalcitrant elements which have to be dragged by main force up to any council table where peace and international association are to be considered and discussed. Aristide Briand, eight times Prime Minister of France, walked no pathway of roses when he went to Locarno, and he took in his hand his own political reputation and future perhaps, and, as many think, the security of the Government of France. M. Briand is not only a most accomplished orator with astounding power of eloquence and skill in presentation of argument and of fact, but a fascinatingly

subtle personality with a temperament of so great charm that it disarms while it seduces. M. Briand brings you to his side with a smile, with a shrewd and kindly word, and then with a formula, the kind of formula that the French mind loves—simple, brief, clear, precise—he states his problem. Argument is made almost impossible.

Doctor Stresemann has become M. Briand's warm personal friend. Tell me, if you please, whether anything so astonishing as that could have been foreseen in 1914? Doctor Stresemann has his own ultranationalists to deal with. They have no overweening desire to build on the foundations that the present offers. They keep pointing day by day to the occupation of the Rhineland, to the Silesian partition, to the Polish corridor, and they say to Doctor Stresemann and his parliamentary supporters, "How can you ask us to sit down with France and Great Britain and proceed to formulate new policies of cooperation on the basis that those things are to remain faits accomplis?" But Doctor Stresemann shrugs his somewhat square Prussian shoulders, raises his fine head and smiles, and goes to Locarno.

Let me tell you a story of Locarno that will illustrate far better than any words of mine could what the spirit of Locarno was and what these men were able to accomplish there. Last March the question of the admission of Germany to the council of the league was at issue, and the word had come that Brazil was to use its legal power of veto to prevent the necessary unanimous consent. The night before the decision was to be taken, M. Briand and Doctor Stresemann were closeted together in a back room, smoking vigorously and discussing how to meet the situation that had developed. Outside was an anxious group of 50 representatives of the world's newspaper press waiting for some indication of what France and Germany were going to do at this great crisis.

M. Briand said: "Doctor Stresemann, I do not see what we can do. Brazil has the power, if she chooses to exercise it, and it appears that she does. I do not see what we can do, do you?"

Doctor Stresemann replied, "No, I do not; we have come to an impasse. Brazil blocks the way, and we can apparently do nothing." "I will tell you what to do," said M. Briand, "Let us go to bed. Let us sleep over it, and perhaps something will come to us in our dreams and we shall get light." Doctor Stresemann said, "Splendid!" The door was thrown open. Briand and Stresemann went out to face the waiting newspaper men, arm in arm. Briand took his cigar from his mouth and he said, "Gentlemen, I have pleasure in saying to you that Germany and France are in absolute agreement as to the next steps to be taken."

That was telegraphed from Japan to Chile, and the world was gratified beyond expression at the obvious cooperation and rapprochement between Germany and France. That story is authentic.

What I wish to emphasize is two things: First, the element of leadership that exists, and second, the cordial trust and confidence between men who traditionally represent long-standing bitter enmities. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the association between these three men—M. Briand, Doctor Stresemann, and Sir Austen Chamberlain—with their friendly understanding, their intimate personal touch, their complete confidence, is the key to an understanding of what is going on in western Europe. Their countries, delighted, have risen to their support, and each man is stronger to-day with the public opinion of his nation than he ever was before in his long parliamentary career.

Locarno, Mr. Chairman, means much more than a series of treaties. Locarno is a spirit, a point of view, a determination that, come what will, the old order shall not be restored. What I wish to see, Mr. Chairman, is that my country shall share that spirit and that determination.

Unhappily, the policies as to international affairs—or perhaps the lack of policies—that have been pursued by our Government since the armistice, have made this Nation of ours a dangerous derelict adrift on the high seas of international intercourse, and lying straight across the path of every ship that sails laden with the precious cargo of international friendship and concord.

Has not the time come, is it not already late in the afternoon, for our people to rouse themselves from their lethargy, dulled by what Iago called the "drowsy syrups" of a material prosperity, possibly temporary, into a sullen and cynical indifference to those great causes, those great appeals, those noble ideals, which in other days stirred the soul of Americans, and which our fathers sent Franklin and Adams and Jefferson overseas to explain to the Old World from which we sprang? Surely we make a sorry spectacle to ourselves, to the on-looking and mystified world, and to the historian who some day will tell the story of it all.

When Jefferson put his pen to the Declaration of Independence, what was it that gave distinction and unique character to his preamble? It was his "decent respect for the opinions of mankind." We were not isolated and aloof then. We were not isolated and aloof when Washington sent Jay to negotiate that great treaty with Britain. We were not isolated and aloof when Jefferson pursued the Barbary pirates that were preying upon the world's commerce. We were not isolated and aloof when Henry Clay's voice from the floor of the House of Representatives made that appeal which called South American nations into being. We were not isolated and aloof when we offered welcome

and distinction to Louis Kossuth, the Hungarian revolutionary. We were not isolated and aloof when Secretary Blaine penned his first call for a Pan American conference. We were not isolated and aloof when John Hay wrote his note as to the open door in China. We were not isolated and aloof when Mr. McKinley and Secretary Hay sent that great delegation to the first Hague conference, and when they saved that conference from disaster by inventing and carrying to completion the court of international arbitration. We were not isolated and aloof when Mr. Secretary Root wrote his truly notable instructions to our delegates to the second Hague conference, instructing them, as representatives of the Government of the United States, to leave no stone unturned to bring into being a Permanent Court of International Justice, and distinguishing, as he so well knows how to do, between the possibility and duty of international association and cooperation in respect of common ends and the avoidance of interference with the internal policies and concerns of any nation. We were not isolated and aloof then, and we were not isolated and aloof when the awful blow fell in 1914, when the world staggered. We were not isolated and aloof in France and Belgium and on the seas. We were not isolated and aloof when the time came for the great settlement.

And Mr. Chairman, in the months of June, July, and August, 1919, the representatives of our two great political parties were so nearly at one that the tragedy which followed is multiplied many times in its sadness and its horror. A little bending here, a little yielding there—a change of this phrase or a change of that—and the history of these last years would have been strangely and splendidly different.

In anticipation of meeting this company, I have examined to-day certain files and records covering those months of intimate confidential negotiations. I can only say that I am not going to write a book, and I can give the same excuse that Lord Beatty is said to have given when he was asked in London whether he proposed to write a volume or two containing his memoirs of the war. He said, "No; because so far as I can remember, I have done nothing that needs explanation or apology."

Now, we are confronted, Mr. Chairman, with a practical situation. A great many of our people seem to be satisfied to sit toying with their taboos and their totems and counting their comforting coins. One of their taboos is that somewhere there is concealed an American tradition that we never have anything to do with anybody. Where it came from I do not know. The phrase, ascribed to Washington on which it usually is based, Washington never saw. He died before it was written. It was used by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural, and it had no more reference to the sort of thing of which we are now speaking than it would have to equipment of a Polar exploration expedition. Our entire tradition, our entire historic development, has been absolutely the opposite. Why, it was only the other day that this isolated Nation and aloof, was, through hundreds of boards of aldermen, scores of legislatures, and I think the Congress itself, passing resolutions calling for the dismemberment of the British Empire. That was at a time when the Irish vote was important. What would they think if the common council of the city of Prague, for example, should pass a resolution demanding that the city of New York refuse to be downtrodden and oppressed by the upper part of the State, should be set up into a separate government?

No, Mr. Chairman, the tradition, the history is exactly the opposite. The only way in which damage of this kind can be repaired is by the slow process of the reeducation of public opinion. There is no possible use in trying to pass statutes, acts, resolutions—meaningless words all of them—unless public sentiment and public opinion support and practically compel them. From this day on, with Locarno's name upon our lips and its symbol and significance in our hearts, the appeal should be in season and out of season to our American people to leave off talking about things that do not matter, to stop this chatter about a prosperity which never can be more than a means to an end, and to set ourselves to the great task of rebuilding our intellectual and moral leadership and taking hold of these situations, to the world's betterment and to our own best interests. Why, every ant hill is prosperous!

I have no hesitation in meeting our adversaries on the field of interest. Only I prefer to appeal from that interest which is the stomach and the pocket to that interest which is the head and the heart. The nations of the world, excepting ourselves and Soviet Russia and one or two more, have established the League of Nations. Before the campaign of 1920 I signed with 30 or 40 men of my party a statement that we believed that the election of the candidate whom we favored would lead to our support of that movement, and we based it upon his own words, in which he said "call it society, call it league, call it association, call it what you will, we are concerned not with the form, but with the substance." And what I signed in October, 1920, I honor with my signature now.

If times have changed, those of us with convictions have not changed; but the facts are now wholly different and the problems must be approached by new methods. We are now ready and should be ready by formal treaty or engagement to accept as our own the Locarno definition of aggression, and we should then be ready to say that if war breaks out in this world by aggression on the part of any power

signatory to that definition, we shall recognize no neutrality right on the part of our citizens to participate in that war by providing materials with which to carry it on.

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth"—

said Lowell. Some of our old and precious doctrines, excellent in the eighteenth century and well down into the nineteenth, have been legislated by fact into the realm of the morally impossible. Surely it should require no treaty, it should require no formal engagement, to keep the American people from being drawn, by reason of an attachment to a doctrine of neutrality that is now outworn, into even indirect participation in a war of aggression. We may define aggression as an act in defiance of the will or against the interest of another government or people without first submitting the issue to the impartial examination of a competent authority to determine what the facts may be and what are the equities involved. If that definition of aggression be accepted—and I know of none better—then for us to say that under the terms of a legal doctrine now quite out of harmony with modern progress, we demand for our citizens the right to participate indirectly in such a war by furnishing munitions and supplies to the aggressive belligerent, is a grotesque travesty on our common sense. We must quickly and publicly take the contrary stand.

If we were to do that, Mr. Chairman, clouds that still rest over the head and heart of Europe would quickly roll away. Believe me, they are afraid that in an aggressive war among themselves arms and destructive implements would be obtained from this neutral country.

Mr. Chairman, in an aggressive war there can no longer be neutrality. We must stand with the nation that keeps its word, and we must not side, even indirectly, with a nation that, through temper, through ambition, through wrong feeling, or for any one of a hundred reasons, violates its pledge and proceeds once again to bring down upon us such an avalanche as 1914 let loose.

From the standpoint of security western Europe is content. There are problems in the central and eastern portions; grave problems. There are nations not schooled in self-government; with no long background of order and economic prosperity behind them; with a great many inherited and traditional animosities which the stronger and the older peoples must help hold quietly in check while instructing them in the art of peaceful cooperation and self-development.

For myself, I believe that the key to the elimination of the Balkan problem is to be found in an economic union of those peoples. Let them begin to work together in economic cooperation and let that economic cooperation be successful, and we shall have come a long way from conditions that have disturbed Europe, and, through Europe, the world for a hundred years.

In the northeast of Europe there are new nations in the making. They were torn suddenly from the side of an old historic empire. They are feeling their way, trying to come to national self-consciousness and to arrive at and protect national independence; to participate in these international conferences as equals; to do their part; to give their counsel; to get their benefit. We have no immediate contact with them, to be sure, but our concern is that through any of them there may not be lighted once more the torch of fire that shall reach inflammable material lying loose in that section of the world.

But if I were the foreign minister of a Balkan state or the foreign minister of one of the new nations in northeastern Europe I should be disposed to ask my country's diplomatic representative in Washington to suggest that the processes of arbitration and judicial settlement need not be confined in their operation to European nations. That could hardly be deemed an act of intrusion, but it would suggest something which, to the best of my knowledge, has been largely overlooked up to the moment in certain places.

One thing more: There could be no more inappropriate moment than this to talk about enlarging our naval forces. It makes no difference whether the ratio ought to be 5-5-3 or 5-5-3.9 or 5-4-3.2, this is not the time to talk about it. There is such a thing as a psychological moment, and now when the eyes of the world are fixed on what is to follow Locarno, how that is to be made permanent and built into the institutional and intellectual life of Europe, what could be more distressing, what more disheartening than to find the American Republic concerned, not with Locarno, but with the pre-war psychology of armaments?

It suggests once more the recurring question which it is so difficult satisfactorily to answer: Can men learn?

Abraham Lincoln, in his great debate with Douglas, used words about public sentiment which have come ringing down the decades since they were spoken. "Public sentiment," said Lincoln, "is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed." Public sentiment reached from the platform, from the press, through the personal contacts of men and women with mind and vision and heart and feeling, public sentiment is the objective upon which those of us must move in our concern for our country's fame and repute, for her highest interest, and for her place in history as a builder.

To the public sentiment of the American people I would say to-night, using words that have come across the ages, "Choose you this day

whom ye will serve"—the pagan idols of destruction and desolation and war, or the God of righteousness and progress and peace!

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to speak out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I ask to interrupt the proceedings of the House for a few minutes to call your attention and the attention of the country to what will be a historic event in the development of the western portion of the United States.

Ever since the earliest pioneers began exploring the West, the great range of Rocky Mountains that runs north and south through North and South America has been a most formidable and dangerous barrier.

Its jagged peaks, some 30 of them in my State, reaching up into the clouds, over 14,000 feet, and covered with perpetual snow, have caused the untimely death of many thousands of daring and brave souls. That great Continental Divide separates our country into two nearly equal divisions—the Atlantic and the Pacific drainage basins.

All of you who have ever traveled from the Eastern States to the Pacific coast, no matter over what railroad you went, have crossed over the top of the great Continental Divide; that is, the main range of the Rocky Mountains. While you may have gone through a short tunnel, like the one on the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad over Tennessee Pass in Colorado, you have always noticed the long and steep grades on both sides of the backbone of this Nation. Ever since the 22d day of September, 1923, a few heroic and determined citizens, backed by the public-spirited people of four counties and of parts of five other counties in Colorado, have been persistently driving a broad-gauge railroad tunnel through the main backbone of the Rocky Mountains, and to-night at 10 o'clock President Coolidge, using the historic gold key that was used in opening the Panama Canal and over a special wire stretching from the East Room of the White House, 2,000 miles to the center of that tunnel, 3,000 feet under the Continental Divide, between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, will press the button that will set off 300 pounds of dynamite and blow out the only 8-foot barrier now standing between the two headings and let daylight through the pioneer bore of the Moffat Tunnel. [Applause.]

The tunnel is 50 miles west of Denver. It has been built by contract. The contractors had to work from both sides of the mountain. They have run in 3½ miles from the eastern slope and a little over 2½ miles from the western slope. It has been one of the most difficult pieces of engineering ever undertaken in this country, aside from the Panama Canal. The engineers had to triangulate over James Peak, 13,260 feet elevation, and a drill hole through this final 8 feet yesterday shows that there is less than 1 inch of error in that gigantic undertaking. [Applause.]

No higher tribute could ever be paid to a set of engineers than the completion of this tunnel has demonstrated. The main tunnel is 6½ miles in length, 24 feet in height, and 18 feet in width, which is the largest and longest standard-gauge railroad tunnel on the American continent, if not in the world. It will be large enough for the largest engines and longest transcontinental trains. It is built for the purpose of shortening the railroad distance and eliminating the heavy railroad grade and avoiding the deep snows in the winter. They have also built a pioneer tunnel parallel with the main tunnel to facilitate the work. That tunnel is 8 feet high and 8 feet wide, and after the main tunnel is finished it will be used to transport water from the western to the eastern slope, primarily for the use of the city of Denver.

No State or people has ever shown more ingenuity or undaunted courage and stick-to-it-ness than Colorado has displayed in this monumental undertaking. A great deal has been published in numerous journals and papers about the engineering work and the difficulty of construction of this gigantic tunnel. But I will only say that the elevation of the mountain range immediately over the tunnel is 12,000 feet, and during the construction through long sections of the tunnel they encountered soft rock and broken material and a slide formation that simply crushed the largest steel beams they could use. The hardest possible rock is a delight to miners. What they dread is loose, broken, or soft rock that gives and keeps giving. At times it seemed utterly impossible to get anything strong enough to hold up the 2,500 feet of rock over their heads or stop the cave-ins. They encountered perfectly torrential rivers of waters. Tunnel crews were sometimes compelled to work in water up

to their necks. To prevent being drowned they were forced to use pumps that would pump out 3,000 gallons of water a minute. We doff our hats to the hard-rock heroes who thus broke the backbone of the Continental Divide and drove this tunnel through the base of James Peak. Twenty-seven men sacrificed their lives in the work, and many more were injured. But, considering that, there were some 7,000 men engaged in a most frightfully hazardous occupation, the casualties were remarkably small. Everybody connected with the work has encountered unforeseen hardships and disappointments, and some almost heart-breaking discouragements. But be it said to their everlasting glory they never faltered or wavered in their work for a minute. Those heroes have been making history in the heart of the Rocky Mountains.

And when President Coolidge sets off the final charge that fires the "holing through" last shot, there will be 21 bombs fired off in Denver and in several other cities, and one of the biggest and most hilarious celebrations in the history of Denver will start to-night. It will be a great tunnel celebration in "The queen city of the mountains and plains." We of Colorado are supremely proud of our capital city of Denver. With her over 300,000 population she is now the twenty-fourth city in population in this country, and we confidently believe she is the newest, the most symmetrically built, the most up to date, the cleanest, and most beautiful city in the world. And all the people of our "Centennial State" join with Denver and the other counties in justly taking supreme pride in the splendid and successful accomplishment of this marvelous undertaking. The story of this Moffat Rocky Mountain Tunnel will make the heart of young America beat with pride for many years to come. Hereafter the public can travel through instead of over the great Continental Divide from the Atlantic to the Pacific slope of our country.

As soon as the smoke from the last shot is blown out of the tunnel this evening, Gov. William H. Adams, of Colorado, will enter from the eastern portal, and Gov. George H. Dern, of Utah, will enter from the western portal, and will meet at the point where the pioneer bore was just "holed through" and shake hands and exchange salutations and felicitations over this final great accomplishment of connecting the East with the West.

Mayor Ben Stapleton, of Denver, and Mayor C. Clarence Neslen, of Salt Lake City, and W. R. Freeman, president of the Moffat Railroad, and many more public officials, will be present on this memorable occasion.

Neither you gentlemen nor the country can fully realize at this time what this tunnel means. It means a direct highway across the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And while it is one of the highest standard-gauge railroads in the world in the center of this tunnel—reaching the elevation of 9,242 feet under a shoulder of James Peak—yet it is a railroad grade that is at no place more than 2 per cent. It means that the great city of Denver, the largest between Kansas City and the Pacific coast, is now for the first time practically on a direct airline across the continent. It means not only a great convenience and saving in time and expense to the traveling and shipping public, but it means an enormous development for the State of Colorado. And for that reason I say this Moffat Rocky Mountain Tunnel is a milestone and marks an epoch in the development of the West.

There is yet a short stretch of road very easy to be built known as the Dotsero cut-off near my home in Glenwood Springs. When that is completed, as it will be soon, it will shorten the distance from Denver to Salt Lake 175 miles. It will eliminate some 30 miles of 4 per cent grade over the divide, and largely terminate the use of many enormous snowplows every winter at ruinous expense. It will open to development many thousands of acres of coal and farm lands and open possibilities of tremendous growth of population and bring many thousands of new residents and millions of dollars to our State.

I wish I had the time and space to mention the names of some of our splendid citizens who so richly deserve to have their names inseparately and forever connected with this great enterprise.

This story is an epic in western skill and determination. The history of this tunnel will be written and due credit given to all. But I can not refrain from saying that the honor roll will always be headed by David H. Moffat, and followed by the name of William G. Evans.

Whose names will follow those two, I can not say. But near to them will be "the tunnel commission," composed of W. P. Robinson, Charles McAllister Willcox, W. N. W. Blayney, Charles H. Leckenby, and Charles M. Wheeler.

And near those will be the contractors, F. C. Hitchcock and Charles C. Tinkler, and George Lewis, general manager and chief engineer, and I would give a very prominent place to two native sons of Colorado that we are proud of—Maj. Burgess G.

Coy, resident engineer at the east portal, and James F. Cohig, resident engineer at the west portal, and also Maj. L. D. Blauvelt, and office engineer Clifford A. Betts, and many others. And there are also many hundreds of splendid loyal women who have done their full share in all this work.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. PURNELL. How much does that tunnel shorten the distance?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It shortens the distance between Denver and Salt Lake City 175 miles.

Mr. PURNELL. How much in the matter of time?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It will shorten the time about 12 hours, which is a great deal more than that distance would indicate, because it cuts out the high grades on which trains can not make time.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Can the gentleman tell us how much it has cost approximately?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The total cost of the tunnel will be about \$12,000,000, and it has been built at the expense of what is called "The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District," composing the counties of Denver, Grand, Routt, and Moffat, and parts of the counties of Boulder, Adams, Jefferson, Gilpin, and Eagle. That part of the State issued bonds and raised the money and elected "The Moffat Tunnel Commission" I mentioned.

That commission has had charge of the entire business from beginning to end, and they let the contracts to Hitchcock and Tinkler, who have actually built and completed the tunnel. Of course, there is considerable incidental work to be done yet, and the regular train service through the tunnel will probably not begin before about the 20th of July of this year.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does this complete what was formerly called the Moffat route?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, indeed; and every loyal son and daughter of Colorado is proud to realize that this is the final consummation of the dream of 50 years of one of Colorado's greatest and most honored pioneers, David H. Moffat, who spent his grand life and great fortune in trying to build this great trans-mountain highway; and we all sincerely hope his superbly loyal Colorado spirit is to-night proudly looking over the million citizens of his beloved State, and the officials, the engineers, the miners, and workmen who have so grandly brought about the realization of his life's hope, as President Coolidge fires the final shot that opens for all time this great highway through the center of the highest range of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is it not true that during certain months the old route was blocked so deep with snow that sometimes the railroads could not operate?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes. There have been weeks at a time when the snow was piled a hundred feet deep on the tracks over the top of the divide; and to-day while the rock miners are drilling the 26 holes for the last shot, 2,500 feet under James Peak, a terrific blizzard is raging and the wind is blowing 60 miles an hour this minute over the top of the mountains above them.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is it practical to use it all the months of the year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes. This road will always be open—every hour in every day in every year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has no objection to placing the statement in the Record that this is in his district?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I confess I am proud of the fact that the western half of this tunnel and most of the railroad and four of those counties are in my congressional district. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. What railroad will use this tunnel?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Denver & Salt Lake Railroad and the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad and probably others in years to come.

Mr. CROWTHER. One good thing about this is that the Federal Government has not contributed any money for it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not a dollar. [Applause.] We have accomplished one of the greatest engineering feats of this age with our own brains, our own courage, and our own money, and we have also furnished to the United States a great direct highway across the continent on a perfectly safe and practical

grade, and all Colorado is proud of it, and we are also proud to have our President of the United States touch off this final blast at 10 o'clock to-night.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and your people ought to be proud of themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; we are! thank you. President Coolidge is also going to make a short speech to be transmitted over the radio to-night to Colorado and to the splendid people who have built this tunnel.

I will insert in the Record the message of appreciation that President Coolidge is sending to Colorado, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Following is President Coolidge's message:

"I am glad to have the privilege of participating in so noteworthy event as the opening up of the water tunnel of the Moffat Tunnel in Colorado. The breaking through of the last rock barrier by my pressure on a key here in Washington will mark another engineering achievement.

"The completion of this conduit for supplying water to Denver and surrounding territory is particularly important, because it foreshadows the putting into commission within six months, I am told, of the railroad tunnel paralleling it and forming the major part of the project.

"That new transportation artery, burrowing through the Continental Divide for 6 miles, making it the longest of its kind in the Western Hemisphere, cutting down the maximum railway altitude by almost a half mile and reducing the grades, will mean much, not only to your State, but to transcontinental travel and commerce.

"I congratulate those associated in this enterprise and the citizens of Colorado, who will be the most direct beneficiaries.

"Very truly yours,

"(Signed) CALVIN COOLIDGE."

And the message that the tunnel commission and contractors, general manager, and attorneys are sending in response to the President's message follows:

REPLY SENT PRESIDENT

The following message of appreciation was sent President Coolidge by members of the commission and others interested in the project:

"The Moffat Tunnel Commission, representing the Moffat Tunnel improvement district of Colorado, desires to express thanks to you for emphasizing the national importance of the Moffat Tunnel.

"As a means of creating a new railroad route through the Rocky Mountains and serving the needs of the people of Denver and the people of a vast rich and fertile empire in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah as well as a means of furnishing Denver and eastern Colorado with water for irrigation and municipal uses, it is unique in the history of great American engineering accomplishments.

"Your pressure on the telegraphic key at the White House at 8.10 p. m. Friday, February 18, touched off the charge which blasted out the remaining rock in the 6 miles of the water tunnel and assured the completion of the longest railroad tunnel in America at an early date.

"The people of Colorado, Denver, and the Moffat Tunnel improvement district take pride in this accomplishment and the opportunity it affords.

"W. P. ROBINSON,
"CHARLES J. WHEELER,
"C. MACA. WILLCOX,
"CHARLES H. LECKENBY,
"W. N. W. BLAYNEY,
"Moffat Tunnel Commissioners.
"NORTON MONTGOMERY,
"ERSKINE R. MYER,
"Attorneys.
"GEORGE LEWIS,
"General Manager.
"F. C. HITCHCOCK,
"C. C. TINKLER,
"Contractors."

I thank you all, gentlemen. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado yields back three minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to speak out of order. I hope I shall get the attention of the House at this time on the measure which I discussed the other day. I cast a few pearls on it the other day, and the membership rather trampled me underfoot, but they at least did not turn again and rend me.

I want to speak a little further on the Muscle Shoals bill.

Last night near 10 o'clock the House finally passed the McNary-Haugen bill by a very considerable majority.

But this is not what I arose to discuss. I want to call attention again to the next most important item of farm legislation. As I have recently said from this floor, the two things which have of late most discredited this House in the eyes of the public have been our failure to pass some general farm-relief legislation and our failure to meet the situation at Muscle Shoals. I believe that the latter proposition is doing more to hurt the reputation of this Congress than the former has done. And if we adjourn and go home again with nothing done on this situation we thereby strengthen the impression that we as the Representatives of the people have either shown ourselves incapable of functioning in an important situation or have been swept off our feet by pernicious propaganda or controlled by methods even more pernicious.

As most of the membership are aware, I introduced on Tuesday of this week a bill for seven years' operation of the Muscle Shoals plant by a Government corporation of which the directors are to be the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of War—heads of the three Federal departments most concerned in this great enterprise.

I want to say now to the House that both from the Congress and from the country I have received expressions of approval far beyond my expectations. I am thoroughly convinced that if this House were given a vote to-morrow they would approve a plan for opening Muscle Shoals to immediate operation under Government control, either temporary or permanent. My bill proposes to make it temporary, providing that the enterprise may be handled by the Government at least through its experimental stage. If this plan had been adopted five years ago when the House voted to accept the Henry Ford proposition, I am sure that by this time the country would have received large benefits and profits from the splendid service which Muscle Shoals is capable of rendering. But, what is still more important, we should certainly have been able by this time to test the thing out by actual experiment and experience, so that both the Government and the syndicates which are asking for leases could have had some definite idea as to what plans and proposals were feasible.

I hold in my hand a bundle of letters which I have received. One is from a lumber company in north Mississippi expressing hearty appreciation and approval of my plan and urging that it be vigorously pushed. Another is from an able newspaper man in the capital city of my own State, who expresses the view that it would be criminal to turn Muscle Shoals over now to a combination of power companies and says that if these giant water powers become captives to private monopoly it would mean good-bye to popular government. Still another is from a Federal reserve bank governor in one of our greatest southern cities, who says:

I have read with a great deal of interest your address on Muscle Shoals. I want to say that my views on this important question are very similar to yours, etc. I hope that most of the Members of the House will in time come around to your way of thinking.

And still another is from a business man of state-wide reputation, who says:

I read that the Government is selling juice from Muscle Shoals at 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. We pay 8 cents, with 12½ cents for each room as a service charge. I shall certainly pray for your success and for God's blessing on your efforts.

But what is perhaps still more significant is the number of Members of both this House and the Senate who express to me their unqualified approval of my idea, but say, "I do not see any chance of passing it this session." And "there is the rub!" I am definitely convinced that if the Members of this House would put out of their heads the idea that we can not do anything and get busy to bring something about, the bill could be passed in less than a week. If the Military Affairs Committee and the Rules Committee would cooperate to get the bill before the House it would not take the House long to pass it. But some say, "That would do no good, because the thing would die in the Senate." It is at least interesting to me that of the few Senators that I have consulted two have expressed to me the hope that if the House would really pass such a bill the Senate might yet be stirred to action on it even within the limits of this session. Certainly neither the House nor the Senate have before them enough legislation of greater importance to justify crowding this out.

Again, if the House should pass such a bill, we shall then at least have cleared ourselves in the eyes of the public, shall have put the power companies on notice that the Government is not going to have this important business forever blocked by their plans or lack of plans, and shall have started something that

will certainly mean earlier legislation on this important enterprise.

And as said before, if we adjourn without doing anything, we again shock the confidence of the people in the efficiency, if not the integrity, of their Government, and that is certainly one of the most serious things that can happen to any country. The greatest asset of any government is the loyalty and the confidence of its people, and the opposite spirit on the part of the people is the greatest possible danger to any government. But the most serious truth of it all is that we are in a measure justifying this resentment on the part of our constituents.

The thief convicted before the court said, "I didn't care about their accusing me of stealing that hog; what made me mad was that they proved it on me."

We, the representatives of the people, are in bad enough shape when they accuse us unjustly, but we are in much worse shape when they are able to prove it on us. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Clerk will report the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in compliance with the recommendation of the President contained in his message of January 7, 1927, the sum of \$75,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of further participation by the United States in the work of the preparatory commission at Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of making preliminary studies and preparations for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armament; and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including compensation of employees, travel, subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act); and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "subsistence," insert "in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State."

Mr. FISH. That is not a committee amendment?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. It is in the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not think there is any question at all but that Congress should authorize this \$75,000 for the purpose of engaging in a preliminary conference looking toward a disarmament agreement among the nations of the world, and I perhaps would not have had anything to say on the resolution if it had not been for the remarks of my genial friend from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], asserting that the United States was now crawling through the back doorway of the League of Nations.

I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that the United States has never crawled anywhere, and never will. [Applause.] Although the sentiment is unanimous in this country for a minimum-sized national defense, I do not think it might be well to let the countries of the world know that although our attitude is for a minimum in national defense, if the United States fails to find a spirit of cooperation in that theory among the other nations of the world, the United States can and will build her national defense sufficient to command the respect of every nation and all of the nations of the world. [Applause.]

That is the kind of national defense I want. I do not want the body of my Nation to become a weak and spineless institution by lack of sufficient nourishment or exercise to the extent that she shall become a laughing stock to the nations of the world.

Personally, I want to say to those nations which have turned down the request of the United States for disarmament in certain branches of the national defense that as one Representative, if they do not cooperate in reducing their armed forces, I am ready to begin to put every kind of pressure on there is to collect every single dollar of debt they owe us, and that as fast as possible. [Applause.] I do not believe it is necessary to say that under your breath. I want France to know that if she is not willing to join hands with the United States—a Nation whose precedents have all been on the side of peace—and sit in a conference for the sole purpose of finding out if there is not a plan by which we can reduce the armaments of all nations—thus not only saving the taxpayers' money but minimizing the tendency toward war—I shall as a Congressman expect France to walk up and pay, and that in the immediate future.

I do not believe it is necessary for us to mince words any longer. I would say the same thing to the other countries

seeking loans in America. If I had control of the loaning of money, I would not loan money to a nation that would not at least agree to sit in a conference to find out if it is not possible to reduce the armaments, not alone in one branch but in every single branch that looks toward war, because there is no more wasteful occupation that a nation or a family of nations can have than that of the prosecution of a war.

I want it distinctly understood that until all the nations of the world are willing to join hands I, as a Congressman, will vote for a national defense in every line in the United States equivalent or superior to any single power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. I do not believe this committee or this Congress ought to hesitate to vote \$75,000 or \$75,000,000 if necessary. I do not believe we add anything to the prestige of the United States by insinuating that we are trying to crawl into the League of Nations' back door. We are not going into the League of Nations' back door or into their front door. That has been decided and determined for all time in America. But if the League of Nations can propose a conference for the consideration of the reduction of armaments, I am one Congressman who is not afraid to go and sit in and see if we can in any way assist the demoralized European continent in getting something into their minds outside of warfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question of whether the League of Nations has called this conference or whether it has been called by some other power, to my mind, is unimportant. The question before the House is the kind of conference it actually is and the amount of \$75,000 that is being appropriated in the bill now before the committee to provide a junctet for a lot of individuals to go to Geneva for three or four months this summer. This conference is not a new thing, my good friends. It has been going on for a year. We have had our experts in attendance over there. They have come back and reported that it was impossible to make any headway; that there are 19 different nations sitting in on a conference with a view to promoting a formula for procedure. They are not attempting to agree on a ratio for scrapping, nor, in fact, on anything else that is binding to us. The formula will probably come back to us for ratification. That formula, once agreed upon, will be the basis for a future conference; the Lord knows how far off. In the conference of last year, as well as this coming year, Czechoslovakia will be voting with France, Hungary voting with somebody else, on the limitation of our Navy. Why, they have not even a rowboat or a harbor, yet they have equal voting strength with the United States and Great Britain.

Our experts having returned to the United States, have reported to the President that they are making no headway and that they can not make any headway under existing conditions. The President of the United States on the 10th of this month sent an invitation to but five of the foreign powers, asking them if they would meet with us in Geneva with a view to extending the 5-5-3 ration limitation on capital ships down to include all war ships under 10,000 tons. It must have been evident to President Coolidge that the present larger conference can never function beyond a debating or a deceiving stage. It is the League of Nations conference for which we are appropriating \$75,000, and I will assure my genial friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] that he need not worry about France sitting in at it. Of course, France will sit in because she controls most of the votes. What does Czechoslovakia care about the limitation of our Navy; she will vote with France, and so will Poland, if she knows what is good for her. France will surely sit in, but will not sit in in the smaller conference just requested by the President of the United States. She is afraid of British diplomacy.

Mr. BEGG. That is the conference I was referring to; the League of Nations conference does not interest me.

Mr. BRITTEN. But an appropriation for that conference is not before the House.

Mr. BEGG. I used it for an illustration.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, the House will appropriate the \$75,000. As the gentleman from New York aptly said, it is for no other purpose than to demonstrate the good faith of the United States in its desire for armament reduction. Of course,

as the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] said, it is sweet to think of nations loving one another. It is ideal to think of France and Germany caressing one another at conferences, but the suggestion of universal peace which the gentleman from Ohio has been putting forth for 20 years, while delightful to listen to, does not work out. Men will fight when they have something to fight for. The wealth of the world, the commerce of the world, the domination of the sea, are all worth fighting for, and that is the reason why England will not sit in on the conference requested by the President of the United States on February 10 unless France and Italy do likewise.

Do you gentlemen suppose for a moment that England will agree to limit her cruisers and her destroyers without having some agreement with France about limiting submarines? Certainly not. It is silly to suggest such a thought.

The Mediterranean is as important to Great Britain as is the North Sea. Her tremendous commerce goes everywhere. Unless Italy and France accept our invitation—and they have indicated that they will not—there will be no small conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has said that it is not necessary for us to build up to the 5-5-3 ratio, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] suggests that we should lead the way and probably destroy what little of our Navy we have left in order to show good faith to Europe that we really want to disarm.

That is the one certain way to prepare your country for a good licking. The gentleman from Iowa has always been a small Navy man. The gentleman from Ohio has always been a small Navy man, and I advise the young Members, the new Members of Congress not to be moved by these delightful sentiments expressed so finely by the gentleman from Ohio. He is a past master at that ideal art of expression. He preaches love and good will among men. It sounds fine and brings much applause, but it never works out. It never has in the past and will not in the future.

Unless we follow the national naval policy adopted under President Harding—and it was a national policy—promoted by the General Naval Board and signed December 1, 1922, after the Washington Disarmament Limitation Conference, which provided for a 5-5-3 ratio for all warships of the Navy, we are heading into a fight. I know there is no sign on the horizon to-day of war with any country, but just as soon as we become weak other nations will find a cause for war.

We have all the gold in the world; we have most of the commerce; we have the greatest field for plunder that the world has ever seen; and most of the world owing us money. Unless we keep our national defenses in first-class fighting form, we are heading for war. It may take 2 years; it may take 10 years; but just as sure as there is a God in heaven if we allow our Navy to degenerate into a third class, we have not a proper national defense, if we do not let the world know that we are prepared to lick anything that comes here to despoil our territory, ambitious nations will come over by combination or otherwise, and they will lick us. Then these idealistic men like the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Iowa will say, "Who would have thought that men or nations could be so cruel?"

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman says that the ideas of the gentleman from Ohio have never worked out. I would like to ask the gentleman if the opposite ideas have ever worked out in the history of the world?

Mr. BRITTEN. China to-day is a good example of unprepared and unorganized strength. British and all other foreign troops have no right there. In 1914, if we had not been prepared as we were, we would have had a war with Japan.

Mr. KVALE. Did the ideas championed by the gentleman work out in Germany?

Mr. BRITTEN. The defeat of Germany has set up several dictatorships, including Soviet Russia. It has made all of Europe a checkerboard of unrest and dissatisfaction, with every nation distrusting his neighbor. Any day may bring a series of wars. We would be loaded up with lilies and candy and cologne and sweet meats if idealists had their way; and when an enemy came over here we would throw candy and flowers at them and tell them not to fight.

Mr. KVALE. Oh, that is not fair to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, this resolution appropriating \$75,000 for a junket will be adopted by the House, and as an expression of good faith, perhaps it is worth \$75,000; but mark my words, just as sure as you are setting here that conference to which these delegates are going will be a farce and a fizzle; and I will stake my reputation on it as a guesser in this House that it will wind up next summer as a farce and a fizzle despite your appropriation of \$75,000, notwithstanding the desire of your experts and this administration to frame some kind of a plan upon which a future conference can meet with a view to the limitation of naval armaments.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. After the sad experience of the German Kaiser, does the gentleman believe that in the next 25 years any other nation will—

Mr. BRITTEN. Declare war?

Mr. BLANTON. No; will be disturbed about our ability to defend ourselves.

Mr. BRITTEN. The experience of the German Kaiser merely leads to other wars. We have set up now a half dozen dictatorships in Europe.

Mr. BLANTON. But I am talking about the knowledge of other nations in respect to our ability to defend ourselves.

Mr. BRITTEN. A blue-print Navy offers no defense. Talk is cheap. If we are prepared, we need fear no one.

Mr. BLANTON. You will not fool the other nations about it or about our ability to defend ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 1, line 7, after the word "commission," insert "under the auspices of the League of Nations."

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not offer this amendment as a friend of the original resolution, or as a friend of the Republican administration, or as a friend of the League of Nations. I offer it for the purpose of telling the truth to the American people. It is a strange thing to me that this resolution has come in without the words "League of Nations" appearing in any part of it. I do not want these delegates with \$75,000 in their pockets to go over to Geneva and hang around street corners trying to find out where the other members are. Somebody may frisk them of the \$75,000. I want them to know just where they are going. They are going to the League of Nations. Talk about the country crawling! Of course, the country does not crawl.

Mr. CARSS. The gentleman says he fears the delegates may be "frisked." The gentleman is not under the impression that they are going to New York, is he? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; they are not going to New York. If they were going to New York they would get a decent and hospitable reception. The gentleman evidently has in mind Chicago, or fears that perhaps they may run into the farm bloc which robbed the entire country yesterday.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARSS] is not from Chicago.

Mr. BLACK of New York. That is all right; he is near enough to it to be one of them. Talk about crawling! The administration tried to crawl through the back door of the World Court to the League of Nations, but was tripped up by the Senate. It then got up and brushed off its clothes and tried to look respectable and now it is trying to get into the League of Nations as though it were a speak-easy. Why, they do not even mention the name of the League of Nations in this resolution. Mr. Chairman, we do not need to have any extended agenda about disarmament. We know what the other countries should do. We know that they have not lived up to a 5-5-3 treaty. We know all that Great Britain has to do is to cut down on cruisers. We know that all Japan has to do is to cut down on submarines. We do not have to discuss economics and all these other questions that appear in this agenda. If we send any delegation to Geneva, let us send a delegation of protest, protest against the violation of the Washington conference, protest against the shelling of Damascus, protest against the massing of troops by the countries of the world in and about China. That is what we ought to do. What is the purpose of this resolution? It is simply to get us into the League of Nations on the matter of disarmament, and then cut the feet

from under us and arrange a program by which we will ultimately be bound. So far as the administration is concerned, it is simply so that the administration may say, "We will build no more cruisers while the boys on the other side at Geneva are discussing various things in this agenda about factories and the number of men they have and the size of the men and what ought to be done." I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who finds fault with military men going over there, that the other fellows are going to have military and naval men there, and that we ought to have them there.

I think these conferences, all of the disarmament follies, are just steps in the war game. This is a step in the war game. The Washington conference turned out to be a step in the war game. The Italians had it right the other day. President Coolidge invited them into another disarmament conference. The Italians said, "What has the United States to give? It can not lose anything by another disarmament conference. If she gets any kind of a break at all she cuts down the comparative strength that is against her."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I did not get an opportunity to speak in favor of the gentleman's amendment stipulating that this was a League of Nations conference before it was defeated. While I do not often agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], because we are of opposite political parties, still he certainly has struck at the most fundamental and vital weakness of the resolution now under consideration, to wit, its League of Nations connections. While the resolution itself very clearly evades the mention of the League of Nations, let us be under no illusion that we are not voting to participate in another League of Nations conference, called, controlled, and dominated by the league through the subtle operation of the votes of its members and the machinery set up by the league. The citizens of this Nation have on more than one occasion overwhelmingly repudiated the league and all its works. Let the House not deceive itself in this matter. I repeat, this is a League of Nations conference. It is closely allied with the League of Nations, no matter how cleverly gentlemen may seek to camouflage the fact, and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] has so aptly pointed out, the members of the League of Nations will be there in full voting force. They will be represented by their military and naval experts. I remind the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who would take from us the privilege of sending our own naval and military advisers.

I do not flatter myself into believing that any words of disapproval on my part may influence this House to the degree of causing it to defeat this measure, and perhaps it will be worth \$75,000 to prove that another such conference will be an utter and complete and dismal failure, as have been its predecessors.

In reading the report on the resolution I am struck by a paragraph on page 9, in which the gentlemen who have prepared the report say that they propose to leave to the discussion at Geneva the ratios of France and Italy, taking into full account their special conditions and requirements in regard to the type of vessel in question, referring, I presume, to submarines.

Now every Member of this House knows that the Mediterranean Sea is nothing more nor less than a link in the great artery between the British Isles and the great Indian and Australian empires. Certainly Great Britain, with a line of communication running from Gibraltar to Malta, and out through Suez via the Indian Ocean to Australia and India, is going to be very much interested in the character of naval policy and of naval vessels operating under the flags of Italy and of France, the latter running from Marseille to the 55,000,000 or 60,000,000 inhabitants under French sovereignty in the north of Africa. What of Italy under Mussolini—with her North African empire—actual and hoped for? Certainly Great Britain is going to be interested in the Italian line of communications crossing this same vital artery of the British Empire. She can not afford to limit her cruisers unless submarines are limited. These cruisers of the British Empire in their passage through the Mediterranean are en route somewhere; to where? They are en route to somewhere east of Suez, somewhere in the vicinity of the great naval base which Great Britain is now preparing to erect at an expenditure of \$60,000,000 at Singapore. Her whole far eastern policy is involved. All her vast possessions in that area are at stake. Will she yield these? Study her history. And can we greatly blame her?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. And tracing this line of communications into the Far East leads into the sphere of influence of Japan, and this proposed further limitation vitally affects her commercial and national interests in that whole far eastern area, the very area where so much trouble exists now and where lurks at every turn alarming forces which may at any moment light the tinder box of a future war.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that the expenditure of this money will be useless and futile. But if for the purpose of making a gesture the House in its wisdom—I hesitate to say in the "valor of its ignorance" of the world situation—desires to throw this good money away, after much which has already gone before it—thanks to our trusting national disposition—in futile attempts to make impossible arrangements and agreements, let us go ahead and do it.

It is strange that just before Congress adjourns, always in the final hours of the legislative jam, there comes before it another proposition affecting world peace, and again, as before, always through the instrumentality of the repudiated League of Nations. On March 3, 1925, when the so-called Pepper resolution was pending in the Senate, there was a resolution presented here by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. No Member of the House has more respect for him personally than I have, but we all know of—and some deplore—his League of Nations proclivities. The Pepper resolution, then pending in the Senate, provided that, as a condition precedent to the United States going into a World Court, that such a court should first be dissociated in every manner, shape, and form from the League of Nations. Many Members of this House, myself included, feeling that they desired to give their approval to the kind of real World Court embodied in the proposition for disassociating it from the league, voted for the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Ohio, because the Pepper resolution specifically designed to accomplish this was then pending in the body at the other end of the Capitol.

What happened? During the summer of 1925 the League of Nations Democrats and proleague Republicans of that other body got together and arranged to substitute the so-called Swanson resolution, and when the Congress reconvened in the fall of 1925 the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate was confronted with the proposition to first reconsider and then table the Pepper resolution, and the Swanson resolution, taking us headlong into the League of Nations court, was substituted in its place. A more unholy piece of legislative duplicity was never practiced on the people of this country and on the Members of this House, who voted favorably upon the resolution submitted by Senator BURTON on March 3, 1925. It would be gratifying, indeed, to learn that our distinguished colleague from Ohio had no prior knowledge of the subterfuge thus practiced upon us. I hope he will some day enlighten us upon this point. It would be of historical interest to coming generations.

Now, just prior to another adjournment, we have here another resolution taking us headlong into another League of Nations agency, where we know in advance and from previous experience that all the cards are stacked against us, and where there is no opportunity to arrange an agenda which will carry out the intent of the President or of the Congress as to the further limitation of armaments. How are we to know that it is not now the artful purpose of this resolution to estop or endanger our present program of adequate naval defense? A burnt child fears the fire, and one holding my views who voted for the Burton resolution on the World Court on March 3, 1925, hesitates to vote for another resolution, with league colorings, supported and strongly advocated by the same gentleman on February 18, 1927. We know that he loves us but we fear he loves the league more.

I do not speak often on the floor of this House on matters of this kind, but I do not think I have the reputation here of being a bloodthirsty militarist Member, or as one who is opposed to world peace and to the limitation of armaments when I am convinced that those with whom we attempt to negotiate are as sincerely inclined as are we. I simply submit this query to the thinking Members of this House: When has this Nation of ours ever lost a war and when has it ever won a conference? [Applause.] I hear the reply coming—never. I hope that it will not be ever thus, but I do not think we will contribute to world peace or hasten the millennium by failing to recognize the facts as

they exist. Our patriotic duty in this matter is not to follow blindly such well-intentioned gentlemen as Messrs. BURTON, of Ohio, and FISHER, of New York, but to think and reason the matters out for ourselves; and while it is well to keep both eyes on the stars, it is well to also keep both feet on the ground during our meditations. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The House is in committee considering a resolution under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; a joint resolution.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has any amendment been offered with respect to the sum of \$75,000? If not, I wish to add "or so much thereof as may be necessary." I have the utmost confidence that it will be expended properly, but I think we should guard it carefully always by some such modifying clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTAGUE: On page 1, line 5, after the figures "\$75,000," insert the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will indulge me one moment, I wish to say that I hope very much the entire resolution will pass. I have no great optimism as to its accomplishments, but I take this view of it: That we may not accomplish very much by participating but we will suffer harm if we do not participate. Our presence may not be very availing, but our absence will invite unnecessary and perhaps rather unfortunate criticism. Therefore I think the resolution should pass.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As a matter of detail I offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to these requests?

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like to state to the House that it was the intention to have another bill brought up this afternoon. The committee has been very liberal in this debate, more than three hours having been consumed, and I certainly hope gentlemen will soon conclude and permit the resolution to be adopted.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is much less debate than we had yesterday.

Mr. PURNELL. I will say we have a very important farm bill to bring up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to these requests?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPDIKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I have no doubt in my mind what will be the ultimate results of this appropriation of \$75,000 for the further limitation of armaments. I do not think anything of any serious consequence will develop from it, but I want to say to you here this afternoon that I am in favor of any appropriation of any kind which will further peace in the world. [Applause.] I shall support this resolution with the hope that it will at least show the good faith of the United States Government toward world-wide peace.

It has been charged from the floor of this House on many occasions that the only Members of Congress who were in accord with a building program that would result in a big Navy were those who have navy yards in their respective districts. I want to say to you gentlemen this afternoon that I represent a district composed of one of the largest inland cities in the world, and that city has no navy yard. Yet, I believe in an adequate national defense through our Navy. [Applause.] My district, however, is composed of good, loyal, patriotic American citizens, who believe in America first, last, and always.

There is no reason in the world why any Member of Congress should oppose an appropriation which would be of benefit of which they would even think might be of benefit in furthering peace in all the world. I myself would gladly sacrifice my life

here and now or at any time if by doing so I knew we could have everlasting peace throughout the whole world.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I ask for this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] if he will tell the House, and for my own personal information I would like to know, whether the statement made by the gentleman from California is true that this conference is directly under the League of Nations?

Mr. BURTON. Well, it was called by the League of Nations. I explained at considerable length our association with the League of Nations, and our acceptance of invitations to participate in conferences or commissions which they had called.

Mr. MURPHY. A further question, and it is this: In this conference in which we are going to take part, is the voting power determined by the rules of the League of Nations? Does Great Britain and all the others taking part in that conference vote according to the representation given to them by the League of Nations under its rules?

Mr. BURTON. To answer that question in a general way I will say no. Each nation has a vote and that is a procedure not fixed by the League of Nations.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for an interjection?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Every small nation participating in that conference—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Switzerland, and 14 others of these small nations—have an equal vote with the United States.

Mr. BEGG. And no navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true. Nineteen of them participated last year, and there will probably be 19 participating again this year, and nations like Poland, I will say to my friend—and we got this from the experts who were over there—and Czechoslovakia who were tied up with France and who had no interest in our Navy always voted with France. As a political expedient Poland will vote with France and Czechoslovakia will vote with France, otherwise France will take away her military support as well as her financial support of those countries.

Mr. FISH. I would like to try to answer the question in a general way. The result of the conference that is called will not be determined by individual votes.

After they have decided on something, a treaty is drawn up and those who want to ratify, ratify it. But there is a very great distinction between that procedure and the procedure of the League of Nations, the League of Nations being composed of the council and the assembly. Under article 5 of the League of Nations every action taken by the league must be by unanimous consent, just as if every piece of legislation that was put through the House or the Senate had to go through by unanimous consent. One small nation can block any action on any matter in the League of Nations.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; but the gentleman will agree with what I said a moment ago that the 19 small nations taking part in the conference for the reduction of naval armaments have a vote equal to the vote of the United States.

Mr. FISH. Yes; but the vote does not make so much difference because after they have agreed on some proposition, it is then put in the form of a treaty and those who want to ratify, ratify it, and if the small nations do not want to ratify the treaty it makes practically no difference.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say that this conference is not aiming to agree on anything but a formula for another conference. That is all they are aiming to agree on, and they can not even get together on that.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would rather vote for one hundred times the amount involved in this resolution for plans leading to world peace—the purposes for which it is to be appropriated—than to vote for the money that we are to expend if the three-cruiser proposition is adopted. Much has been said here this afternoon criticizing our friend from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in what he has been doing along the line of this resolution.

I wish every Member of this House could have been here when the Interparliamentary Union met in this Chamber with over 30 countries represented here by members of their parliaments, and I wish that all could have seen the marked respect that every one of them showed our distinguished friend, Senator BURTON, of Ohio. [Applause.] I would like to see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] head every delegation that goes over to Geneva, because I know that whatever they may think about the acts of various political leaders of this country here

and there I know that they respect his earnest work to bring about world peace, faithfully performed for many years, and his sincerity, because there can be no question about that.

My friend from Indiana [Mr. UPDIKE] may not have any navy yards in his district, but the gentleman is getting on the band wagon early. The gentleman, with keen political acumen, sees the handwriting on the wall here during the last few days and weeks on this Navy program, and this whole fight here, made to-day by our friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] and by our friend from California [Mr. LINEBERGER], is nothing in the world but a preliminary fight for this cruiser program that soon is going to come up here on a conference report. It is nothing in the world but a preliminary battle in behalf of the three-cruiser program, and I am only taking the floor hoping that the same crowd of men who supported the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the splendid fight he made for the people of the United States and the people of every country in the world, will stand by him and see that he has an adequate regiment of votes here at all times when it is necessary.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. By the same yardstick, might we not say that the gentlemen who are so enthusiastically favoring this proposition are doing so as a preliminary fight against the three cruisers?

Mr. BLANTON. I will admit that I am just answering some of the gentlemen who are firing the first shots in behalf of the big naval program.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is not that what is animating the gentleman somewhat in his attitude here to-day?

Mr. BLANTON. I will admit that I am simply answering the attack brought up here by our friend from Illinois and our friend from California.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I am glad to hear the gentleman admit it.

Mr. UPDIKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. UPDIKE. The gentleman knows I was in favor of the three cruisers and have always been in favor of an adequate national defense.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the gentleman was on the rear end of the band wagon the other day, but now he is crawling up on the front seat.

Mr. UPDIKE. That statement is not fair.

Mr. BLANTON. No, it is not; that statement was made facetiously, of course.

Mr. UPDIKE. I was not on the rear end of any program. I am always on the front end of any program for an adequate national defense for this country.

Mr. BLANTON. I will admit that. The gentleman may not know it, but he is on a band wagon nevertheless.

Mr. UPDIKE. That is all right, and I am willing to stay on the band wagon.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Indiana knows that he and I are close personal friends.

Mr. UPDIKE. We certainly are.

Mr. BLANTON. And what I said was wholly facetious, and not meant in any way that could be offensive to him.

Mr. UPDIKE. I appreciate that.

Mr. BLANTON. But I was impelled to take part in this big Navy skirmish. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment, which was a pro forma one.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, we have had the fullest and fairest debate on this resolution and before moving that the committee rise I simply want to make one observation to the House. In case our delegates at the meeting of the preparatory commission are able to reach a satisfactory basis for the limitation of naval armament and we enter a conference on disarmament later on and a treaty is drawn up and brought back to this country the House of Representatives should vote on it. Under Article I, stating the legislative powers of Congress, the House and the Senate have power to maintain and provide a navy and in case a treaty is drawn up and brought back for a further limitation of naval armament, I think it is worth while for the Members of the House to consider whether it is not their duty, having the power and obligation of maintaining a navy under the Constitution, to have such a proposal brought before this body before it is acted on by the Senate in the form of a treaty. We have a certain responsibility, and I submit this suggestion as an observation only, but hope the Members will give it their consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with amendments,

with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House Resolution 352 and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FISH a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Following are the conference report and accompanying statement.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16863) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 16.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$564,805"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendment numbered 6.

L. J. DICKINSON,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
FRANK MURPHY,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
CHARLES CURTIS,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16863) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment No. 1: Changes the designation of an employee in the office of the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to committee employees of the Senate: Provide for the employment of additional clerks heretofore paid under various Senate resolutions and corrects a total in the bill.

On Nos. 7, 8, and 9, relating to employees under the office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate: Provides for 37 doorkeepers, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 38, as proposed by the House; provides for an additional clerk, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects a total in the bill.

On No. 10: Appropriates \$50,844 for expenses of reporting debates and proceedings of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$44,844, as proposed by the House.

On No. 11: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate relating to the office of legislative counsel and appropriates \$75,000 for this office, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 12 and 13, relating to the Architect of the Capitol: Appropriates \$100,735.80, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$99,235.80, as proposed by the House, for general expenses of the Capitol Building and Grounds; and provides, as proposed by

the Senate, that the appropriation for the extension of the Capitol Grounds shall be immediately available.

On No. 14: Appropriates \$14,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$12,000, as proposed by the House, for furniture, shelving, etc., in the Library Building.

On No. 15: Appropriates \$564,805, instead of \$570,745, as proposed by the Senate, and \$559,765, as proposed by the House, for salaries in the Library of Congress.

On No. 16: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate fixing the pay of employees of the Government Printing Office when on annual leave.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon Senate amendment numbered 6, providing for the compensation of clerical assistants to Senators for a period not exceeding two months after the death of the Senator by whom they were appointed.

L. J. DICKINSON,
JOHN W. SUMMERS,
FRANK MURPHY,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: That hereafter when a Senator dies during his term of office the clerical assistants appointed by him, and then borne upon the pay rolls of the Senate, shall be continued on such pay rolls in their respective positions and be paid for a period not longer than two months: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to clerical assistants of standing committees of the Senate when their service otherwise would continue beyond such period.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter when a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives dies during his term of office the clerical assistants appointed by him, and then borne upon the pay rolls of the Senate or House of Representatives, shall be continued on such pay rolls in their respective positions and be paid for a period not longer than one month: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to clerical assistants of standing committees of the Senate or House of Representatives when their service otherwise would continue beyond such period.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to agree with an amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa, is it intended that this shall apply to the Commissioners and Delegates sitting in this House?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think it should apply. Of course there are none in the Senate.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The amendment uses the words "Member of the House" and does the gentleman think that would embrace the Delegates and Resident Commissioners?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think it would be well to insert that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They have the same privilege of clerical hire.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by including Delegates and Resident Commissioners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter when a Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate, or Resident Commissioner dies during his term of office the clerical assistants appointed by him, and then borne upon the pay rolls of the Senate or House of Representatives, shall be continued on such pay rolls in their respective positions and be paid for a period not longer than one month: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to clerical assistants of standing committees of the Senate or House of Representatives when their service otherwise would continue beyond such period.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 419.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 419

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1640, an act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I hope that it is possible to eliminate any debate on the rule.

Mr. ASWELL. I understand that the gentleman from North Carolina does not desire any debate on the rule, but have the debate on the bill?

Mr. PURNELL. That is entirely agreeable, but I would like to make a statement of one or two minutes as to the purpose of the rule.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which takes \$300,000 out of the Treasury, and I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. PURNELL. I hope the gentleman will not do that, it only delays the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think the longer the bill is delayed the better it will be for the Treasury and the people.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Aldrich	Fredericks	Madden	Stedman
Anthony	Freeman	Magee, Pa.	Strother
Arentz	French	Magrady	Sullivan
Ayres	Gallivan	Mead	Swartz
Bankhead	Golder	Milligan	Swoope
Bell	Goldsborough	Mills	Taber
Bixler	Gorman	Morgan	Thomas
Bloom	Graham	Morin	Tincher
Brand, Ga.	Greenwood	Nelson, Wis.	Tucker
Britten	Hadley	Newton, Minn.	Tydings
Burtress	Hale	Newton, Mo.	Underhill
Canfield	Hardy	O'Connell, R. I.	Vaile
Carpenter	Hare	O'Connor, N. Y.	Vare
Celler	Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Volgt
Cleary	Hill, Md.	Perlman	Walters
Connery	Hudspeth	Porter	Welch, Calif.
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Welsh, Pa.
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Pratt	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kiefner	Quayle	Williams, Ill.
Dickstein	King	Ryce	Wingo
Doyle	Kirk	Robison, Ky.	Woodyard
Drewry	Kunz	Sabath	Wyant
Ellis	Kurtz	Scott	Yates
Faust	Lampert	Sears, Nebr.	
Fenn	Lee, Ga.	Smithwick	
Frear	McSwain	Spearing	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those Members of the House who have just been called here because of the point of no quorum, I shall state that I have just called up House Resolution 419, a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which, if adopted, will make in order the consideration of Senate bill 1640, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes. Owing to the lateness of the hour, I had hoped that we might dispense with any debate on the rule. The rule provides for two hours of general debate upon the bill. Does the gentleman from Louisiana wish time on the rule?

Mr. ASWELL. I have no desire to take any time on the rule.

Mr. PURNELL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. PURNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am against the bill, and I would like very much to control the time against the bill.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for two hours of general debate, and that half of it shall be controlled by those who are opposed to the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURNELL. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. I am in favor of the bill and think that it should be enacted into law. I am quite willing that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] shall control the time against the bill.

Mr. PURNELL. There will be no objection to a member of the Committee on Agriculture under those circumstances controlling the time against the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. I intended from the beginning to make that suggestion.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1640, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1640, with Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. After the clash of interests yesterday which divided us so sharply, it is a genuine pleasure that chance brings to-day an opportunity to speak a word in behalf of the welfare of agriculture, and to attest that an eastern man from a district where agriculture does not predominate may yet take a keen interest in that which encourages production and which benefits not only the farmer but also the whole Nation. Furthermore, I esteem myself fortunate in that circumstances brought to me the honor of introducing the bill now before you—fortunate not by reason of any personal or sectional consideration, but because the proposal intends important benefit to all parts of the country and so to the common welfare.

This bill contemplates the purchase of a tract of land about 2 miles northeast of the Capitol, which, through many years has been brought to the attention of Congress at nearly every session, as one that it was desirable to acquire for the benefit of the public. It was through a long period discussed in connection with the Botanic Garden, and inasmuch as that institution is under the charge of the Committee on the Library, of which I am a member, I have presumed that the introduction of this bill was intrusted to me as such. There is no other significance in the fact that my name was attached to it.

The tract of land in question is known as Mount Hamilton. It comprises a ridge bearing that name, which is, perhaps, a half mile beyond the end of Maryland Avenue along the Bladensburg Road that leads to Baltimore. East of it is another elevation known as Hickey Hill, and between are old farm lands. This tract reaches to the marshes of the Anacostia River, which are already owned by the Government, some 400 acres in extent, now being drained by the Army engineers, and to become part of the park system. The Mount Hamilton tract when its purchase was first suggested comprised about 400 acres, but part of it has already been taken over for building purposes and is no longer available for the use here in mind. It is probable that somewhere between 300 and 350 acres could now be secured. This is in the hands of about 30 owners, but those who own the larger part of it have, with real public spirit, resisted the offers of speculators in order that it might come into the hands of the Government, and at a price much below that which the speculators would give. The larger owners inform us that their duty to others will compel them to accept these offers if we do not act before the close of the present session.

Originally it was suggested that the Botanic Garden should be moved to this location, but the possibility of that has been avoided by deciding to keep the garden close to its present site. Now it is asked for by the Department of Agriculture as the location for an arboretum, which is a tract for the cultivation and study of trees, shrubs, everything with a woody fiber. The

most important arboretum in the country chances to adjoin my own district, although not within its borders—the Arnold arboretum, which contains 250 acres. Those in charge of it would like to have 50 acres more, for they inform me that 300 acres is about the right size to handle to the best advantage.

This tract will meet that condition perfectly.

Furthermore, there are more than 30 varieties of soil in the tract, making possible the cultivation of many varieties of trees and shrubs. It is rolling ground—upland and field land. It is a tract so beautiful in itself that any Member here who has not seen it would sometime later in the season pass a delightful hour or two should he go there and stroll among its trees and over its fields. About 150 acres are now woodland; not the scrub-pine growth—very little of that—but larger trees of great variety, mostly hardwood growth, with some of them approaching the size of the trees in an untouched forest. So we have there an admirable groundwork for an arboretum, probably as good as could be found anywhere in the vicinity of Washington. The Department of Agriculture desires that this open-air workshop shall be within easy reach of the department building. It has communicated through the Secretary of Agriculture the statement that there should be no delay in the acquisition of the land in question for this use.

Besides the benefit that would be brought to the District by the ornamental nature of the institution, and perhaps more important in passing upon the wisdom of the appropriation, should be considered the practical benefit. Were the hour not so late, and did we all not entertain the hope that we might not be delayed into the evening as we were yesterday, I should be glad to discuss at some length the scientific and practical values to be secured. I should like to relate to you some of the things that the department is now doing under difficulties.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief interruption?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Of the \$300,000 proposed to be appropriated under the bill, how much of it, or approximately how much of it is to be paid for the land, and how much of it is to be used for the development of the arboretum?

Mr. LUCE. It will require the whole \$300,000 for the purchase of the land. The latest value placed on the tract is in excess of that, but it is hoped that all the land which the department importantly needs can be acquired for the \$300,000. And I may add that an arboretum requires but little expenditure in the way of buildings. The Arnold arboretum has only a modest administration building and a small conservatory, smaller than will be found on many private estates. Little money will be needed for buildings, and comparatively little will be required to administer such an institution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has stated that the Arnold arboretum contained 250 acres, but that one of better size would be one of 300 acres.

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Government will already own 400 acres itself when the land is acquired. Why the 300 acres?

Mr. LUCE. The marshland when reclaimed will be valuable only for the study of aquatic plants and trees that ordinarily grow in moist soil or with their roots in the water.

Mr. FISHER. Would not the plants and trees in this part of the United States be very much better able to stand the cold of winter?

Mr. LUCE. Yes; and it is near enough to the sea for the planting of things that are native to more southerly places, much better than if the institution were placed in a spot in the same latitude somewhere in the interior.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman stated that the land had been lately appraised at the value of \$300,000?

Mr. LUCE. Something more than that.

Mr. HOWARD. By whom was that appraisal made?

Mr. LUCE. I am not certain as to the source of the appraisal, but I understand it was by the assessors of the District.

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that is the value placed upon it by the local assessor.

Mr. LUCE. That is what I understood—by the local assessor. I should like to go into details, pointing out the economic importance of such an institution. Possibly other speakers will dwell upon that, or I may have a later opportunity. But for the convenience of the House, in the hope that we shall speedily dispose of this matter, so as not to be delayed to an undue extent, I yield back the balance of my time with the expectation that if there is any mooted point brought up later I may have the opportunity to address myself to it.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. It is stated in the report—

About 400 acres of the proposed site is already owned by the Government. It consists of marsh land about to be drained by Army engineers. The Mount Hamilton and Hickey Hill area, 408 acres, privately owned, was reported by the assessor in January, 1925, to be valued at \$343,048, distributed among 30 owners.

Mr. LUCE. I should add thereto that the assessment made in 1920 was \$254,520; that the value is rising; and that every motive of economy would dictate its immediate purchase if ever it is to be acquired for the benefit of the District; and to lose it as a blessing to the District itself would be an irreparable calamity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back two minutes.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this proposition has been before the Committee on Agriculture for two or three years. I may say it has been given very careful and very thorough consideration and the sentiment is strong on that committee in favor of the proposition.

There are just two or three practical questions that undoubtedly arise in the minds of those who are thinking at all about it, and I want to answer those questions if I can.

In the first place, the question naturally arises as to why we desire an arboretum located at this particular place. I may say that the committee was impressed with the idea that Washington is an ideal location for a Government project of this sort. We already have in the United States several fine arboreta, but they are privately owned and controlled. We have nothing of a national sort. Therefore it has seemed fitting, in view of the new interest that is being taken in the question of forestry and the great importance that forestry shall undoubtedly take in connection with our national life in the next few years that the National Government should become interested in the proposition of establishing a national arboretum. By reason of the fact, therefore, that we have here assembled in the Department of Agriculture the largest corps of experts in that particular line, it seemed only natural that if we could locate some tract of land near by Washington where these experts might have easy access to it such a combination would be almost ideal. Further than this, so far as the climatic conditions are concerned, Washington was thought to be fairly representative of the whole country. Here the trees that might grow in the more rigorous conditions of the northern sections of the country would grow to advantage and here the plants and trees that grow in the southern sections might also develop under favorable conditions, except, of course, those that come from the very extreme South. So from the standpoint of climatic conditions and the availability of this particular point in the United States, because of its suitability to the various kinds of trees that are grown, the committee thought that Washington would be a very advantageous place.

Then, so far as this particular tract of land is concerned, if we are going to have the wide range of plants and trees grown as would be fitting in a national arboretum, certainly we must have all conditions of soil, and so it is contemplated that the 400 acres already owned by the Government on the flats of the Anacostia River shall be a part of this tract of land, and that, together with the fine uplands so delightfully described by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], will, when put together, give us all the range of soil that will be needed to grow the variety of plants and trees that should be found in a national arboretum.

In addition to that may I say that by reason of the fact that here are very many other experimental projects of the Government, it seemed fitting that this new project should find a place somewhere near where these others are carried on. If I were to sum it up in about one word or one expression, I

think we might say that the proposition of establishing a national arboretum here would be something in the way of having a bureau of standards in horticulture located on this tract of land. I do not need to spend a moment with the members of the committee to magnify the importance of the work of the great Bureau of Standards in connection with many other activities of our people; and, with the growing importance of trees and with the increased importance of all kinds of horticulture, certainly I think it is a fine phrase that some one has coined to describe this new project as a bureau of standards in horticulture. For these reasons it has seemed to the committee as if this particular tract of land in this centrally located place was almost ideal for this purpose, and so we gave it strong support.

There are two other phases that I want to dwell upon briefly. First, with reference to one aspect of it that I am sure must appeal to those of us who are interested in the paper industry. I happen to come from the section of the United States that in recent years has taken the lead in the manufacture of paper.

The city of Kalamazoo, Mich., chances to be in the district of my colleague [Mr. HOOPER], and that city has become in recent years the paper manufacturing center of the whole United States. Its boast is that a trainload of finished paper is shipped from that city every day of the year. Naturally, then, we are interested in the source from which we may get a supply of raw materials that go into the making of the very high-grade papers that go out from that city. We have a very practical interest in a national arboretum because the timber supply is vital to the people who are manufacturing paper. I think it is one of the fine things that we may look forward to in the future with regard to this proposed arboretum that experiments may be made here with reference to quick-growing trees that may be imported from foreign countries, so that those of us who are interested in the reforestation of our lands for the purpose of the paper and other industries may know that these necessary experiments will be carried on under most favorable conditions.

In addition to this, I am sure all of us recognize that such an arboretum would be of advantage to the growing industry, I think we may call it, of developing fruit trees by nurserymen. To-day there is a very wide field of experimentation along this line and several members of the organization of the nurserymen appeared before our committee and very earnestly pleaded for the establishment of this arboretum so that here might be established variety standards of all kinds of trees that are grown in the nurseries of the United States, in order that some comparison may be made between the developments in their own local nurseries and the true types to be found in this national arboretum.

So from both angles, the practical and the æsthetic, it seems to me this project is entirely desirable.

One thing that ought to be emphasized in conclusion is that the cost of the project is very moderate when contrasted with the benefits that are sure to accrue in a practical way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. KETCHAM. The total first cost as carried in the bill is \$300,000, and then, of course, there must come the cost of maintenance. As so well stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], this will be a very moderate figure by reason of the fact we are already near to those who naturally would have charge, namely, the men in the Department of Agriculture; and no extensive buildings or equipment will be required. The estimate is that not to exceed \$25,000 or \$50,000 a year will be required for the maintenance of this splendid project.

Therefore it seems to me from the standpoint of sound public policy we ought not to hesitate longer in establishing this arboretum, because the value of this property is increasing. We ought to close the matter up now and launch this very worthy and commendable project, and I hope it will receive your favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks, and in this connection I desire to include a letter from the United States Chamber of Commerce bearing upon this question and indorsing very warmly the project which we now have under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, February 18, 1927.

HON. JOHN C. KETCHAM,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KETCHAM: Yesterday the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States adopted a resolution favoring passage of the bill (S. 1640) for the establishment of a national arboretum.

The value of research as an essential part of a sound national forestry policy has been emphasized through a referendum vote of the chamber's membership. The national chamber believes that the establishment of an arboretum for scientific study and experimentation in problems of tree and plant life, as contemplated in the pending bill, would be of great value to the timber and wood-using industries of the country.

I understand that this bill is to be considered by the House under a special rule. I wanted you to know of the chamber's interest in this measure and its earnest desire that the bill become law.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. O'LEARY, President.

MR. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having had under consideration the bill S. 1640 had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLAGUE, for Saturday, February 19, 1927, on account of important business.

TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE S. GRAHAM, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

MR. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief account of a very remarkable demonstration of affection which was tendered the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the other day by the bar of Pennsylvania. It marked the fiftieth anniversary of public service engaged in by our chairman, Mr. GRAHAM.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. BACON. In accordance with permission given me, I insert herewith in the RECORD, an account of the remarkable tribute paid to our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee by the bar of Philadelphia. This account is taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Wednesday, February 16:

ONE THOUSAND ASSEMBLED AT BAR TRIBUTE TO GEORGE GRAHAM—JURISTS AND LAWYERS EXTOL CONGRESSMAN AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER HERE—CONGRESSMAN, IN ADDRESS, WARNS STATES TO GUARD RIGHTS FROM FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT

Rising at the close of the testimonial dinner which was arranged in his honor and held in the ballroom of the Bellevue-Stratford last evening, Congressman GEORGE S. GRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, bespoke the preservation inviolate of the doctrine of State rights and declared that movements such as that for the Federal administration and limitation of child labor "tend to disintegration and destruction of all local self-government."

Not in many years, if ever, has Philadelphia witnessed such an assemblage of the members of her bar as attended the dinner in the veteran legislator's honor last evening. Fully 1,000 of the foremost leaders, not only of the bar of the city but of the State and the Nation, gathered to tender their individual tributes to Congressman GRAHAM's unflinching zeal in the public service, his love of justice and integrity, and his hatred of the false and the sham and the hypocritical.

The speakers included Francis Shunk Brown, former attorney general of Pennsylvania and now chancellor of the Philadelphia Law Association, who presided as toastmaster; Pierce Butler, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; Robert Von Moschizsker, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; Joseph P. McCullen, judge of the court of common pleas No. 4; former Judge James Gay Gordon; ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, of Virginia, member of the House Judiciary Committee; Hampton L. Carson, also a former attorney general of Pennsylvania; and Congressman GRAHAM himself, who responded at the close of the evening to the number of high tributes which had been paid him.

HALF CENTURY OF SERVICE

When Mr. GRAHAM arose to speak, his manner was hardly that of a man grown old in the service of city and Nation, but rather that of a young man, with his zeal unflagging and unworn by more than half a century of public service behind him. There was vigor in his voice, a flash in his eye, an earnestness in his gesture, so youthful and so undiminished in purpose and pleading that more than one veteran member of the Philadelphia bar was led to compare this gray-haired man with the youthful stalwart district attorney who had so forcefully and eloquently pleaded the cause of justice before the bar those many years ago.

There was more than a hint of emotion in his voice as he arose, and stood silent and erect, as the storm of applause swept the ballroom of the Bellevue-Stratford again and again. At last he raised his hand in mute appeal, and as the tumult fell to a murmur and then to silence he spoke:

"I recall a line from Paradise Lost, where Milton pictures the angel talking to Adam: 'The archangel ended and in the ear of Adam so sweetly left his voice that he a while stood listening, thinking the angel had not finished.'

"I feel to-night like occupying the place of Adam. So many angels have whispered delicious and delightful things into my ears, I fain would have the sweet discourse go on forever, without relaxation and without a call upon me for speech.

"I wondered when word came to me of the proposition on foot to have a demonstration of the bar in my honor why such a thing should be, and the first glimpse of a reason was a letter I received from a friend and brother of the bar down in Florida. After expressing his deep regret at not being able to be present on account of illness, he ends his letter saying: 'It is such a well-deserved tribute of the respect and admiration we all feel for you.'

"My brethren of the bar, I accept this testimonial on that basis and on that basis alone. There is no political reason for it; there is no other element contained in it, and because it is an expression of affection and regard from the men with whom I have been associated for so many years, whose interests are my interests, whose pursuits are kindred to mine, that I am cheerfully here to-night and accepting with keenest gratitude this wonderful testimonial.

FAITHFUL IN ALL DUTIES

"Some one has told a story about St. Valentine, whose day has just passed, and whose popularity has marked him as one of the greatest saints on the calendar. He was fond of color, yet he never painted a canvas. He was fond of music, but his voice was never heard in glad-some song. Many other things attracted his attention, but in some place of fancy a saint appeared to him and whispered, 'Valentine, take care of the little things that come in your path.' 'Ah!' he said in his waking, 'that shall be my motto and rule of life.'

"I have done no conspicuously great things. I haven't done anything that should excite the intensity of admiration on your part, only have I tried to take care of the little things that came in my path, which has been what the public has received with fidelity and principle.

"So much has been said about the past, and so many thoughts have been awakened in my mind, I fain would indulge in some reminiscence, and repeat to you some of the trials and troubles as well, but I am admonished that this is no time for me to indulge in reminiscences. I can only say that when my term as select councilman of your city was ended I had no regret for the performance, or failure to perform, any of the little things that came in the line of duty.

"After the office of district attorney was placed behind me, I only could look back behind that and say, 'I have no regrets.' I never prosecuted a man without conviction first, in my own mind, of his guilt and without a fair opportunity to present everything that might come for his defense. I never failed to prosecute a man when I felt he was guilty and the evidence warranted such a result, whether he was friend or foe, member of my party or of any other party, and when the record of those 18 years years closed, and I wished to retire to private life and to practice of my profession, I laid down the office and its cares and responsibilities without a single feeling of regret regarding any incident of that career."

Then, putting behind him the gentle air of reminiscence, Mr. GRAHAM assumed the rôle of the preceptor, pointing out to his fellow members of the legal fraternity, as citizens and as lawmakers, the fallacies that, in his opinion, exist in the country and its administration to-day.

STATE RIGHTS DEFENDED

"We believe in a return—no! I will not say a return—to the doctrine of State rights," he continued, in a firmer and more resonant voice. "The doctrine of State rights has always been the same. What was settled at Appomattox was not State rights; it was not that right reserved by the Constitution to the States—but it was the right to secede and break up the Union. That is settled and is ended, and now we are looking with careful eyes toward the preserving of the rights of the States and not permitting them to be continually invaded by encroaching laws or amendments to the Constitution.

"I remember very well when the amendment for child labor was fostered, in an effort to place it in the Constitution; to take it away from the States, to take it away from the homes and send the Federal agents here into our houses and homes to regulate the work and the welfare of our children. I remember very well when that question was brought before the House.

"We were in a woeful minority, but we fought, the few of us, our single-handed fight. We helped to send out the propaganda over and across this broad country of ours, and thank God, with the response of over 30 States, we succeeded in deciding against it.

HITS BUREAUCRACY

"We want less of bureaucracy in Washington. We do not want any department to control maternity. Our mothers have controlled that for ages and did it very well, as we are witnesses. We do not want a bureau established to control education. These are all movements tending to a greater centralization than Hamilton ever dreamed of. These are movements that tend to a disintegration and destruction of all local self-government. Local self-government, my friends, is the thing to which we must adhere. It is local self-government that will best preserve our individual liberties, and whenever we part with that and centralize it in Washington, with the miles and miles of country to be governed and patrolled, you are going to inflict a burden that will break this Union into fragments.

"But I did not intend to discuss political questions. Truly, my friends, friends, and I say it from my heart, I am too full of grateful appreciation for this magnificent demonstration, the finest bar meeting that I have ever seen in the city of Philadelphia, to wish to speak at any length or to attempt to express the feelings and emotions that stir my soul to-night.

"I can only say to you that it is flowers scattered where I can inhale the perfume, and not flowers brought to express a memory and an affection for one who has gone. It is indeed a tribute that I regard as one of love and affection that comes to me and fills my mind and heart with the perfume that will go with me as I go down the western slope. I know that I can use no better language than to quote these familiar words of the Irish poet when he said, changing one word in the line: 'So long may my heart be by its memories filled; you may break, you may shatter this vase, if you will, but the scent of the roses will hang round it still.'"

Former Attorney General Brown read letters of regret from Chief Justice Taft, of the United States Supreme Court, who, with NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, Speaker of the House, was unable to be present, because of the press of official duties; United States Senator GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER; Federal Judge J. Whitaker Thompson, of the United States district court, and Alexander Simpson, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

It was Mr. Brown who set the universal atmosphere of the evening when, in his opening remarks as the presiding officer of the evening, he said, "Too often worthy deeds gain public recognition only after the passing on of the man.

"I am happy and grateful for the privilege of joining with you in this testimonial, to express by our presence and our voice our regard for a fellow citizen who for many years has held a distinguished place in the profession we love, and who in public life has attained the highest position, that of faithfully serving the best interests of his fellow men.

ENDEARED TO HOME FOLKS

"The history of Federal legislation, of the Federal judiciary, and of the administration of justice can not be truly written without special emphasis on the labors of GEORGE S. GRAHAM. His legal ability and unselfish devotion to duty have won for him unstinted praise of judges and lawyers, and have merited the gratitude of all law-abiding people. These outstanding qualities, brightened by his splendid personality, have endeared him to us, his home folks and his companions.

"We can with pride acclaim all honor to our associate, Representative, and friend, of whom Chief Justice Taft has written, that 'it may be said with force and truth that he is deserving well of the Republic.'"

LETTER FROM JUSTICE TAFT

Chief Justice Taft's letter, which with the others was read by Mr. Brown, follows:

"I greatly regret that it is impossible for me to attend the dinner which the bar of Philadelphia is to give to the Hon. GEORGE S. GRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, on the evening of February 15 next. My judicial duties and the condition of my health have required me to decline all invitations to dinner or to make addresses. It is only this which prevents me from taking part in your tribute to Mr. GRAHAM.

"I have been in a position to know of the valuable service which Mr. GRAHAM has rendered to the bar and to the country in the promotion of measures for the improvement of legislation with respect to the Federal judiciary, and of his willingness to study with care measures of reform in this field and to promote them with all the weight of his marked ability and his great experience at the bar and in the House. I have never appealed to him in any matter looking to an advance along right lines in judicial procedure that he did not give it the

promptest attention and secure for it the respectful consideration of his committee and of the House of Representatives.

"He brings to his work as the chairman of his great committee not only the qualities, of which I have already spoken, but also that most invaluable spirit of the high traditions of the Philadelphia bar, than which there is nothing finer in the country. It is most fitting, therefore, that you, the members of that bar, should evidence your admiration for the man, the lawyer, and the legislator by such a notable and significant tribute as this. It may be said of Mr. GRAHAM, with force and truth, that he has deserved well of the Republic."

UNITED STATES JUSTICE FIRST SPEAKER

Justice Butler was the first speaker of the evening. He dwelt specifically upon the overwhelming importance of the House Judiciary Committee in regulating the judicial affairs of the Nation, and said that "in the qualities that make for a great leader, GEORGE S. GRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House during the present Congress, has had no superior."

Justice Butler paid a glowing tribute to the preeminence of the bar of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the estimation of the Nation, stating that the first chairman of the Judiciary Committee far back in the early days of the Republic was a Pennsylvanian, reared and fostered among the high traditions of the legal profession of this State.

RECOUNTS MEMORIES

He said that he could remember with peculiar vividness the great figures in the legal life of his own State; that of James K. Humphrey, great figure in the early days of Minnesota's judicial life, and particularly that of Alexander Ramsey, a member of the Pennsylvania bar, who went to Minnesota in 1849 to establish its judicial system.

"Here in Philadelphia," Justice Butler continued, "the eminence of the bar extends far back into the colonial days. It was eminent in every field of activity which benefited the Republic. The Judiciary Committee, now 125 years old, had for its first chairman Charles Jared Ingersoll, a member of the Philadelphia bar.

"The most favored of all the committees of the House is the Judiciary Committee. It has in charge all of the petitions and proposed legislation affecting judicial procedure, civil and criminal law, and deals especially with the most important and difficult fields of legislation, labor, corporations, trusts, and legislation of the most varied character, as well as the creation of new courts and judgeships.

"It has been presided over by the most eminent lawyers of the country—Webster, Buchanan, and Sargent. The work of that committee brings it into contact with other committees, requiring the leadership of a man of the highest skill, character, forbearance, restraint, and all of the faculties making for constructive cooperation.

PRaise FOR COMMITTEE

"The personnel of the committee is composed of the leading lawyers of the House. It makes its multitudes of reports to the House, and when its measures are reported out generalship of the highest order is required to bring them to the attention of the Members and secure their passage.

"In the qualities which make for great leadership, subordinate only to that of the Speaker, GEORGE S. GRAHAM, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the present Congress, has had no superior. It is my privilege and very great honor to wish him happiness and the appreciation of the Philadelphia bar—of a bar that knows no jealousy, that seeks only the opportunity to express its love and gratitude for faithful work well done."

Chief Justice Von Moschzisker's address was one of retrospect, rather than of future or present contemplation, being, in general, a review of the past service of the Congressman, when, as a younger, though hardly less vigorous man, he was for six consecutive terms the district attorney of Philadelphia, during four of which his nomination was uncontested by either party.

"Some years ago, when Chief Justice Taft was President of the United States, he said that 'Above all men, I love a judge,' the chief justice of this State's supreme tribunal began. He had been away from association with judges for some years at the time when he said it and possibly he would express a different point of view, were he asked to do so now, but I must disagree with him, in part at least, and say, 'Above all men, I love a lawyer.'"

ADMITTED TO BAR IN 1870

"Mr. GRAHAM was admitted to the bar in 1870, the same year in which I was admitted to the world, but I can remember him for at least 40 years, because for at least that time I have known him.

"I remember him in the old courthouse at Sixth and Chestnut Streets and recall him then as about the handsomest young man I have ever seen; strong, vigorous, and with that beautiful voice, which first attracted, then held, and finally convinced the jury or the judge.

"There began his great career as district attorney of this county, which lasted for 18 glorious years. The people of this city became so used to him that they never thought they would need another, but he thought otherwise, and, having been elected to six terms, four times being unopposed, he decided to retire for the private practice of the law.

WON OPPOSITION AUDIENCE

"The candidate of the fusionists, who was running for the position vacated by Mr. GRAHAM decided that good politics dictated that he make an attack upon the past administration of the district attorney's office.

"Mr. GRAHAM, being a fighter, wrote a letter to those in charge of the opposition campaign, stating that he would like to be heard on the issue. A great meeting in the Academy of Music was to close the campaign—and he demanded the right to be heard from that platform.

"The house was packed, naturally, by an audience of opposition, but Mr. GRAHAM appeared, accompanied by his assistant, 'Tom' Finletter, now the Hon. Thomas D. Finletter, judge of court of common pleas No. 4. There was some parleying as to whether Mr. GRAHAM should not open the debate, being the challenger, but he insisted that he be permitted to hear what was said and then answer the allegations of the opposition.

"Finally, it developed that the principal indictment of the opposition was that he had prosecuted the most sensational cases in a sensational manner, but had permitted a large accumulation of lesser cases, and that 7,000 indictments had not been tried.

"Mr. GRAHAM rose to reply. For 10 minutes there was pandemonium in the house. The audience would not let him reply. I can still see him standing there with a polite, imperturbable smile on his face, and then his voice ringing out, demanding the right to be heard. There was silence, and then he began to speak.

"He broke down one indictment after another, showing that the majority of the indictments which yet remained untried had been abandoned by the prosecution or the prosecutor had died, and that he had devoted his entire time to the live issues. He actually reduced that audience to submission, and at the conclusion of his address he was greeted with applause and acclaim. After that never a word was ever heard against his glorious record of 18 years as district attorney of the county of Philadelphia."

SHINING RECORD AS CITIZEN

A beautiful tribute was paid to Congressman GRAHAM's record as a citizen, not only of his native city but of the whole Nation, by former Judge Gordon, who said in his address that "the enduring fame of a city depends on the number and achievements of its men of 'light and leading.' Not its accumulated wealth; not the luxuriousness of its life; not the multitude of its inhabitants; not the magnitude of its trade; not its sports or its pastimes will save it from the effacement of time or give it a place in the glorious galleries of history. Its contribution to the thought and culture of the race—this alone will keep its name luminous with the light of immortality."

He described in glowing oratory Mr. GRAHAM's career as a district attorney and finally of the time when he was called from the field of municipal service to that larger and broader field of national service.

"In that great field of beneficial lawmaking and vicious political maneuvering he has advanced with unabated progress to distinction, influence, and usefulness," former Judge Gordon continued. "Again his city has won luster from his name. Again she has cause for pride in her citizen. His latest service has been not alone to his city and his State, but to the whole country and all the people. He has succeeded in placing the judiciary of the entire Nation in a position of dignity and independence where it no longer will be tenable only by the rich or sought after only by the mediocrity. The city of Philadelphia and the bar of the city blesses his name for this fresh crown to his patient, tactful, and wise labors.

Hampton L. Carson, former attorney general of Pennsylvania and at the present time president of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, spoke, as had the others, of the more than half a century of his life which Mr. GRAHAM had given to the public service, and mentioned, with considerable pride, that he had nominated Mr. GRAHAM for the district attorneyship for five successive terms.

He referred in particular to the strenuous efforts the Congressman had made to secure the increase in the salaries of judges, and spoke of him as the leader in the "long struggle for the independence of the bench."

"GEORGE GRAHAM, you have rendered great service," he concluded, "and a service which has become a part of the great heritage of the Philadelphia bar."

Much like the brief address of the former attorney general was that of Judge McCullen, who emphasized the fearlessness with which the guest of honor had ever carried on his duties, whether as a private citizen, as a prosecuting attorney, or as a legislator.

"He has ever been the friend of the court of justice, be it municipal, State, or Federal. He has sought to keep their standard high, and, as was indicated on a recent occasion, he has not hesitated to take drastic steps to obtain drastic ends."

THE CAUSES OF AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to have printed an article taken from the Progressive magazine, which I present in slightly abridged form. It is a keen analysis of the situation, and I am sure that the article will coincide with the views of many of those who have given this matter any thought.

The article is as follows:

THE CAUSES OF AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION

The following extremely interesting article is from the pen of an intelligent American farmer and stockman, who has been and still is engaged in farming in one of the Western States. The advanced thoughts expressed in the article therefore have the practical value which attaches to years of experience:

"The American farmers have petitioned Congress for relief from the destructive economic conditions which now afflict and have afflicted American agriculture for the past six years. In the newspapers of the financial and industrial interests of our country we read that the farmers are asking for a special privilege, and frequently the question is asked by such newspapers: 'Does the American farmer expect Congress to place his industry beyond the operation of natural economic law, the law of supply and demand?'

"Now, if this question were asked by persons whose industries were standing on their own bottoms, and if the price of their products or services were fixed by the natural economic law of supply and demand, it would be a very proper question. But who are the persons or interests objecting to relief for agriculture? Practically all of the objections come from persons who have invested their money in industries, operating on the cost-plus plan, giving them a certainty of return by reason of a Federal or local statute. The selling price of their product or services is based upon the cost of production plus a profit, and this condition has been made possible by the enactment of Federal or State statutes. These laws are destructive of the prosperity of the American farmer and were enacted at the behest of the interests benefited thereby.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKING ACT

"In 1913 and 1914 the American banking interests came to Congress under cover and asked for the enactment of the Federal reserve banking act. This act gives the American bankers a monopoly of the credit of the people. Under that act they have power to deflate or inflate the currency, bring about booms or panics, and it has been a panic for American agriculture ever since May, 1920. Under that law the bankers issue the Federal reserve bank note currency on the collateral of the borrowers. The payment of such notes is guaranteed by the United States Government. The interest paid by the borrowers goes to the bankers, of course. No greater power and privilege was ever granted by a government to private interests since the beginning of history.

"Calhoun, in condemning such policy, said:

"Place the money power in the hands of a single individual, or a combination of individuals, and they by expanding or contracting the currency may raise or sink prices at pleasure; and by purchasing when at the greatest depression and selling at the greatest elevation may command the whole property and industry of the community and control its fiscal operations. The banking system concentrates and places this power in the hands of those who control it, and its force increases just in proportion as it dispenses with a metallic basis. Never was an engine invented better calculated to place the destiny of the many in the hands of the few, or less favorable to that equality and independence which lies at the bottom of our free institutions."

ANTIDUMPING ACT

"At the close of the World War the American manufacturing interests came to Congress with the cry that the European nations would then get to work and produce as never before so as to live and pay their debts, and as there would be nothing for them to do but to work, they would undersell our manufacturers in our own and all other markets. So Congress at their behest passed the antidumping act.

ESCH-CUMMINS TRANSPORTATION ACT

"In 1920 the railroads came to Congress and had the Esch-Cummins Act passed. The basis of this act is the cost-plus plan. Under this act the railroads are not only entitled to a fair return for the actual capital invested, but also the water and fictitious capital now claimed to be real. It invites extravagant cost of operation, high salaries, high cost of repairs and replacements, all at the cost of the public. This act also takes care of the express and telegraph companies on the same basis. This act is undoubtedly the finest and most complete piece of legislation on the cost-plus plan so far devised for the billions of capital invested in our railroads. No risk here whatever, and remember that this was and is done by act of Congress.

THE FORDNEY-M'CUMBER TARIFF ACT

"In 1921 our manufacturers, not satisfied with the antidumping tariff act, came to Congress and wrote most of the schedules of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. Behind the highest tariff wall in the history of the United States our manufacturers are able by price-fixing organizations to operate also upon the cost-plus plan. The Federal

Trade Commission now exists to approve such organizations instead of preventing them. The natural economic law of supply and demand and open competition is poison to them and a man who believes in the old-time American individualism that every tub should stand upon its own bottom, is a heretic more dangerous than a Bolshevik, in the minds of the beneficiaries of the tariff.

LOCAL PUBLIC UTILITIES

"All public utilities are operating upon the cost-plus plan, under local public utilities laws of their respective States. Fictitious capitalization has been the order of the day in such plants. The same rule of extravagance in the cost of operation, high salaries, high rates of interest, commissions, etc., prevail in the operation and construction of these plants, and so that the high rates may be maintained, public utility commissions must be friendly. It is therefore necessary to control the appointing power, the governors of each State where the governor has the appointing power of such commissions.

"These public-utility plants are, for the most part, controlled by capitalists in the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, so that we now have the State governments controlled by the absentee owners of the public utilities. No natural economic law affects these interests, but they are alarmed when there is talk that the American farmer is to be taken into that charmed circle of the cost-plus operation.

IMMIGRATION ACT

" * * * Every baby born upon our soil and every immigrant who lands on our shore adds some value to every piece of real estate in our land. Every speculator in land or real estate figures on the increase of population to raise the value of his holdings. That, however, is not the only effect that immigration had upon the farmer. Every immigrant who lands upon our shores is fed by the American farmer. Neither Canada, Argentine, or Australia feed him, and if 1,000,000 immigrants per year reached our shores for the last 10 years we would now have 10,000,000 more population. Such addition to our population would consume 60,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and millions of dollars worth of other products of the American farmer. We could have selected such immigrants and received the best stocks of Europe instead of the mixed bloods from the West Indies, South America, and Mexico.

AUTOMOBILES AND MOTOR TRUCKS

The introduction and use of the automobile and motor truck have taken from the American farmer the former market that he had in cities for horses and horse feed. All the locomotive power for cities and towns formerly furnished by the American farmer is now furnished by Ford and other automobile and truck manufacturers, and gasoline has taken the place of horse feed. The loss of their horse and horse-feed market by the American farmer can only be replaced by an increase in population. It would take 20,000,000 people to replace that lost market. Yet our American farmers went wild and even now are supporting men for Congress in States west of the Mississippi, Congressmen and Senators, who are openly against an increase of population. When one of the chief factors in the decline of land values of such States is the decrease in their population, what can we say about the economic intelligence of a farmer who follows such false prophets? * * *

The cotton, grain, and hog growers of America have since colonial times produced more of their products than could be consumed at home. They have produced our export articles, which gave us a balance of trade in our favor. The price for their products has always been made in the open markets of Europe in competition with all nations of the world. The cold, unhampered natural economic law of supply and demand always governed the price of their products. Since time immemorial the American grain, cotton, and meat buyers paid the American farmer the Liverpool price, less transportation, commission, and insurance charges. Since 1914 the cost of transportation by rail has increased 50 per cent, on water 100 per cent.

One of the purposes for the destruction of the German merchant marine by the treaty of Versailles was to destroy the competition of that marine, as it was a price cutter and kept ocean rates down, to the benefit of the American farmer.

So the surplus of American farm products has been sold in the open markets of the world, and the price paid for such surplus has fixed the price upon the whole product.

THE EFFECT OF A SURPLUS OR A SHORTAGE OF SUPPLY ON THE PRICE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Every observer of the relations of supply and demand knows that a shortage or surplus, although small in proportion to the total supply, will effect prices in a disproportionate degree. In the seventeenth century Gregory King, an English economist, from elaborate calculations deduced a law governing prices of agricultural products. He calculated that prices varied with supply and demand, as follows:

- "A decrease in supply of
- "One-tenth raises the prices above the common rate three-tenths.
- "Two-tenths raises the prices above the common rate eight-tenths.
- "Three-tenths raises the prices above the common rate eighteen-tenths.

"Four-tenths raises the prices above the common rate twenty-eight tenths.

"Five-tenths raises the prices above the common rate forty-five tenths.

"Thorold Rogers, one of the authorities of our own times, has pronounced this formula 'one of the most important generalizations in statistics' and it has been treated by all writers as at least approximately true.

"Were there 10 additional millions of people here there would be no meat and wheat surplus to trouble the American farmers, but many of them followed the lead of professional uplifters upon this question and howled for total restriction of immigration. Surely, the American farmer was no economist when he followed such false economic prophets.

"Everything needed by the American farmer to produce his crops he has had to buy and is now buying in a closed market. His cost of production is on the same basis as that of the protected manufacturer. The cost of labor to the farmer follows the cost of labor in the cities and factories, and in the last 12 years the cost of labor has increased 125 per cent.

"Keeping up inflated war prices the cost-plus plan for the cities, factories, railroads, and other public utilities, while the farmer has been operating in open competition with the world, has resulted in the shifting of billions of capital from agricultural to corporate stocks and city real estate. The increase in value of the corporate stocks of public utilities, banking, and manufacturing corporations is about in the proportion that agricultural capital value has declined. This shifting of capital values from agricultural to public utilities, manufactures, and banks is due to the acts of Congress and local public utilities acts, man-made laws.

"The answer to the question as to what are the causes of the depression of American agriculture since May, 1920, is simple. Those causes are in plain sight of every man with common sense or ordinary intelligence. To recapitulate, those causes are as follows:

"1. The power given to the bankers to expand or contract the Nation's currency and the practical monopoly granted to banks of the credit of the people by the Federal reserve banking act.

"2. The extravagant and expensive cost-plus plan of all local public utilities, provided for and invited in local public utilities laws.

"3. The destruction of the market for the consumption of agricultural products by the breweries and distilleries by reason of prohibition of the manufacture of liquor by the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act.

"4. The prevention of increase of population by the immigrant act.

"5. The loss of the market for horses and horse feed of our cities and towns.

"6. The high cost of production of his products, which has kept pace and follows the high cost of production of manufactured goods in the cities which is caused by the tariff act, the transportation act, and the local public utilities laws.

"Now, what is the remedy? It is either to repeal all the laws which interfere with natural economic law of supply and demand, and place all our producers on equal footing, the old American doctrine of individualism with favors to none, or else put the American farmer into the charmed circle of the cost-plus producers.

"It has been proposed to give the American farmer the open market price, plus the amount of the tariff, plus the cost of transportation. That is what the American manufacturers are receiving. The present tariff on manufactured articles generally runs from 50 to 100 per cent, while the tariff on farmers' products, which is now noneffective, amounts to less than 30 per cent.

"If there were no surplus of the farmers' products, the tariff on his products would now be effective and he would be receiving just what was proposed in the relief bills. But because the farmers of America produce a 10 or 15 per cent surplus, they receive the open market price of the world, less the cost of transportation and commission. This surplus is to be sold in the markets of the world at whatever it will bring, but it may approximately be taken for granted that from 80 to 90 per cent of the products of the American farms will be consumed by the American people, and for that much of his product the farmer will get the cost of production.

"There is no immediate prospect of repeal of the laws which practically put all American industry, except agriculture, on the cost-plus plan of production, and unless those laws are repealed, to be fair and just to the American farmer, agriculture should be placed upon the same basis as other American industries."

ASSOCIATION SIERVAS DE MARIA, SAN JUAN, P. R.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10728) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the Association Siervas de Maria, San Juan, P. R., certain property in the city of San Juan, P. R.

The Clerk read the conference report.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

10728) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the Association Siervas de Maria, San Juan, Porto Rico, certain property in the city of San Juan, Porto Rico, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
DAVID A. REED,
HIRAM BINGHAM,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
MORRIS SHEPARD.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. FRANK JAMES,
JOHN PHILIP HILL,
HUBERT F. FISHER.

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

CESSION OF LAND AT BATTERY COVE, VA., TO STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11615) providing for the cession to the State of Virginia of sovereignty over a tract of land located at Battery Cove, near Alexandria, Va.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11615) providing for the cession to the State of Virginia of sovereignty over a tract of land located at Battery Cove, near Alexandria, Va., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

W. FRANK JAMES,
JOHN PHILIP HILL,
PERCY QUIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
DAVID A. REED,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conference report was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 19, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, February 19, 1927, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Second deficiency bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10.30 a. m.)

To regulate interstate commerce by motor busses operating or to operate as common carriers of passengers for hire through the interstate tunnel now being constructed under the Hudson River between the city of New York, State of New York, and the city of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, and over the interstate bridge now being constructed across the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the city of Camden, N. J. (S. 3894).

TICKETS FOR JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON FEBRUARY 22, 1927

Mr. TILSON also submitted the following notice from the committee on arrangements for the joint session of the two Houses to be held on February 22, 1927:

Tickets issued to Senators and Representatives—one to each—for the galleries of the House on the occasion of the President's address on February 22, 1927, embrace every seat, both chair and aisle, from which the President may be seen at the rostrum.

To render this possible it became necessary, because of the very limited capacity of the galleries, to utilize the aisle seats facing the Speaker's rostrum.

The few remaining seats, those on each side of the press gallery, in the rear of the Speaker's rostrum—except the front row—are not included in the congressional distribution, but have been assigned by the committee on arrangements to guests unable to obtain a better vantage point.

The tickets distributed to Senators and Representatives were placed at random in small unaddressed envelopes and then inclosed in large addressed envelopes so as to insure their distribution fairly and without favor as to location of seats.

BY ORDER COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1004. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, for public buildings authorized under the provisions of the act approved May 25, 1926, \$19,878,700 (H. Doc. No. 740), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 17155. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to accept an act of sale and a C. S. B. dedication of certain property in the city of New Orleans, La., from the board of commissioners of the port of New Orleans, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14834. A bill to provide for appointment as warrant officers of the Regular Army of such persons as would have been eligible therefor but for the interruption of their status, caused by military service rendered by them as commissioned officers during the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 17088. A bill to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Haiti the Medal of Honor and Merit; without amendment (Rept. No. 2157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16224. A bill for the relief of the DeWitt County National Bank, of Clinton, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10813. A bill for the relief of Finas M. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 17220) restricting the Federal Power Commission from issuing or approving any permits or licenses affecting the Colorado River or any of its tributaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 17221) to amend section 6 of the act of September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 17222) to authorize an additional appropriation for Fort McHenry, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIEHLMAN (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 17223) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 17224) to amend Public Law 254, approved June 20, 1906, known as the organic school law, so as to relieve individual members of the Board of Education of personal liability for acts of the board; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 17225) to provide a memorial branch library building in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 17226) to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio," approved May 13, 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 17227) providing for horticultural experiment and demonstration work in the southern Great Plains area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 431) requesting the Department of State for certain information; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging negotiation relative to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WINTER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, regarding grazing fees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERSEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 17228) granting a pension to Salome Cerrenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 17229) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Converse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 17230) for the relief of Olof Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 17231) granting relief to William Sulem; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 17232) granting an increase of pension to Julia Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 17233) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 17234) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17235) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17236) granting a pension to Kate Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 17237) for the appointment and retirement of John Elmer Wright as a first lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 17238) granting a pension to Frank V. Webster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 17239) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Manchester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 17240) granting a pension to Mary Jane Judd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 17241) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Stryker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17242) granting a pension to Ferdinand Inklebarger; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7017. By Mr. ADKINS: Petition of citizens of Urbana, Ill., urging Congress to take immediate steps to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7018. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of citizens of Palestine, Tex., relating to pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7019. Also, petition of Mr. George Williams, Neptune Association (Inc.), Galveston, Tex., requesting adoption of Senate bill 3574; to the Committee on Immigration.

7020. Also, petition of Galveston Labor Council, for exclusion of seamen from maritime workmen's compensation bill and for passage of Senate bill 3574; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7021. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of citizens of Carroll and Henry Counties, Tenn., requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7022. By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of citizens of Ringtown and Union Township, Schuylkill County, Pa., urging immediate action on the pending bill to provide an increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7023. By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Petition of Vernon R. Cole and other residents of Trumbull County, Ohio, favoring increases of pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7024. Also, petition of Mrs. Addie Colwell and other citizens of Geneva, Ohio, urging increases of pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7025. Also, petition of F. E. Hurlburt and other citizens of Jefferson, Ohio, favoring increases in pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7026. Also, petition of T. D. McFarland and other citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, urging increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7027. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Twenty-eighth Ward Taxpayers' Protective Association (Inc.), favoring the improvement of the Brooklyn post office, and also the matter of additional work for the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

7028. Also, resolutions of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, relative to the hearings held before the Shipping Board on the allocation of the American Republics Line; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7029. By Mr. EATON: Petition of William M. Fink, Rural Free Delivery No. 6, Trenton, N. J., and 38 other residents of Trenton, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7030. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. O. B. Roth, 1323 Tutwiler Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7031. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of Pasadena Post, No. 13, American Legion, urging Congress to take prompt and favorable action on the disabled emergency Army officers' retirement bill (H. R. 4548); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7032. Also, petition of Blind Veterans, National Chapter, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, protesting that Senator WADSWORTH is wrong about the enlisted veterans being against the bill H. R. 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers, and urge the immediate passage of this bill; veterans of all ranks, and particularly disabled veterans, favor this bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7033. Also, resolution of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, unanimously indorsing the Fitzgerald-Tyson bill for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7034. Also, petition of Santa Monica Bay Cities Post, No. 123, American Legion, unanimously indorsing House bill 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers, and urging House of Representatives to vote on bill as soon as possible before the adjournment of Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7035. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Boston Federal Employees, Local No. 25, Michael M. Burke, secretary, customhouse, Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 359, providing for the abolition of the Personnel Classification Board and transfer of its duties to the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7036. By Mr. GAMBRILL: Petition by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, at its eighth annual convention, held at Annapolis, Md., August 26, 27, and 28, 1926, favoring the placing of emergency officers of the Army on an equal footing with officers of the Regular Army as to pay, allowance, and pension; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7037. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Manufacturing Jewelers' Association of Philadelphia, urging support of the na-

tional platinum marketing act (H. R. 16545); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7038. Also, petition of the clerks of the post office at Stillwater, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 16257 and other measures pending before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads which would tend to increase the efficiency of the postal employees and the quality of the public service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7039. Also, petition of Charles W. Dawson, member of the American Institute of Architects, Society of Technology Architects, and American Association of Engineers, urging that sites for future Government buildings be obtained and outlining four lines of legislation for the protection of the Capitol and the White House which the institute has proposed; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

7040. Also, letter from T. J. Womack, Alva, Okla., indorsing Senate bill 2929 and House bill 8708, bills to reduce the interest rate on railroad indebtedness and extend the time for payment thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7041. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of citizens of Royalton, Vt., favoring legislation for the relief of veterans of Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7042. By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of citizens of Casey County, Ky., to increase pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7043. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of John E. Norman, of Vincennes, Ind., urging that steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7044. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Mrs. Laura M. Crider and other citizens of Goshen, Ind., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7045. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of N. E. Carpenter and 105 others, of Okanogan, Wash., protesting against all compulsory Sunday observance bills pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7046. Also, petition of William Kilpatrick and 99 others, of Hillyard, Wash., protesting against all compulsory Sunday observance bills pending in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7047. By Mr. HOGG: Petition of Mrs. Mary A. H. Zimmerman and 56 other widows, veterans, and citizens of Harlan, Ind., asking immediate consideration of the Civil War pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7048. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 121 residents of Meigs County, Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7049. Also, petition signed by 15 residents of Dexter, Ohio, urging that immediate action be taken to pass legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7050. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of citizens of Washington and Ramsey Counties, Minn., urging enactment of bill increasing pensions of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7051. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of Fort Necessity Chapter, Sons of American Revolution, of Uniontown, Pa., favoring peace with preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7052. Also, petition of citizens of McKeesport, Pa., requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7053. By Mr. KOPP: Petition signed by Mrs. N. J. Montague and 35 others, of Keokuk, Iowa, urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7054. Also, petition signed by Frank Moeller and 46 others, residents of Keokuk, Iowa, and vicinity, urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7055. Also, petition signed by C. T. Miller and 74 other residents of Keokuk, Iowa, and vicinity, urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7056. By Mr. McSWEENEY: Petition of citizens of Uhrichsville, Ohio, urging immediate consideration of bill for further relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7057. By Mr. MAJOR: Petition of citizens of Polk County, Mo., urging the immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill, providing increases of pension for needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7058. Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Mo., urging the immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill, providing

increases of pension for needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7059. Also, petition of citizens of Pettis County, Mo., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill, providing increases of pension for needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7060. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition signed by voters of Morristown, Ohio, urging that immediate relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7061. Also, petition signed by voters of Belmont County, Ohio, urging that immediate relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7062. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of Mr. Renel E. Root, of Coopersville, Mich., and 79 other residents of that vicinity in opposition to the enactment by Congress of House bill 10311, or any other bill of a religious nature; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7063. Also, petition of 15 residents of Caledonia, Mich., recommending the enactment by Congress of additional legislation for the benefit of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7064. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of citizens of Stratford, Conn., urging passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7065. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of residents of the second congressional district of Michigan, requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7066. Also, petition of citizens of Jackson County, Mich., asking that certain pension laws be amended; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7067. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., for increase in pensions of Civil War veterans and removal of limitation on date of marriage of Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7068. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Joseph J. Albrecht, secretary Cath Central Verein of America, New York, favoring the passage of the longshoremen's accident compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7069. Also, petition of the Richmond Hill Post, No. 212, of Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the 5-5-3 ratio and opposing the reduction of appropriations for the maintenance of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7070. Also, petition of the International Seamen's Union of America, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3574, a bill to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7071. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of House bill 13474, providing for the future policy of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7072. Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3170, and opposing any proposed amendment to fix a definite maximum amount in death cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7073. By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petition of citizens of Fulton County, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 13450; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7074. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition of the Mason Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America, Mason, Wis., urging that immediate steps be taken to consummate the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

7075. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition by nearly 100 citizens of Watford for the immediate passage of the pension legislation granting increase in pension to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7076. By Mr. SMITH: Petition signed by citizens of Twin Falls County, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation for an increase in the pension of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7077. By Mr. SWEET: Petition signed by members of Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War of New York State, urging the passage of a bill increasing pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7078. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of San Bernardino, Calif., urging the passage by Congress of legislation providing increased pensions for Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7079. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of 50 citizens of Leipsic, Ohio, urging the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7080. Also, petition of several citizens of Van Wert County, Ohio, urging the nonpassage of the Sunday bill (H. R. 10311); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7081. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Ohio, urging the nonpassage of the Sunday bill (H. R. 10311) nor any other bill enforcing Sabbath observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7082. Also, petition of 63 citizens of Cloverdale, Ohio, urging more liberal pension legislation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7083. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Saginaw, Mich., favoring the passage of further legislation providing increases in pension for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7084. Also, petition of residents of Ionia, Mich., favoring the passage of further legislation providing increases in pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7085. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition signed by numerous residents of Greenup County, in the ninth congressional district of Kentucky, urging the passage, before adjournment of Congress, of a bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

SATURDAY, February 19, 1927

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 17, 1927)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, Senate bill 3331.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3331) to provide for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to present four amendments to the pending bill and ask that they may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON. I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business temporarily be laid aside in order that we may proceed with the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill in charge of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash.

House Joint Memorial, No. 3

To the honorable House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and pray as follows:

Whereas under our present Constitution the President, Senators, and Representatives take up their duties many months after the day of election; and

Whereas the provisions of the Constitution herein sought to be amended are antiquated and unworkable under modern conditions to such an extent as to be, in some cases, a positive menace to the best welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas the Senate has seen fit to offer and pass a constitutional amendment, known as the Norris amendment, providing that such officers shall take office promptly after election, and have sent the same to the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do earnestly and respectfully pray that the House of Representatives will take similar action at the earliest possible date and present the same to the legislatures of the various States for their adoption; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state, under the seal of the State of Washington, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, at Washington, D. C., and to each Senator and

Congressman from the State of Washington, and to the legislature of each of the several States a full, true, and correct copy of this joint memorial.

Passed the house January 26, 1927.

RALPH R. KNAPP,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 3, 1927.

W. LON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
County of Thurston, ss:

I, J. Grant Hinkle, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of House Joint Memorial No. 3, as passed by the twentieth session of the Legislature of the State of Washington.

Done at Olympia, this 14th day of February, 1927.

[SEAL.] J. GRANT HINKLE, Secretary of State.

Mr. EDWARDS presented petitions, numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the names, as follows:

SUMMIT, N. J.

To the Hon. EDWARD IRVING EDWARDS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The game birds of this country are rapidly being exterminated through barbarous treatment, which permits every man among our vast army of hunters to bag each day 25 ducks and a similar number of other birds. Immediate legislation by Congress can save this important value to the Nation, and this is the hope of sportsmen and people who love nature throughout the Nation.

The Copeland-Merritt bill, now before Congress, Senate bill 3580, House bill 10433, offers considerable relief, and we, the undersigned citizens of New Jersey, entreat of you to use all possible influence in passing the above-named bill, and so saving our birds for the benefit of this and future generations.

To the Hon. EDWARD IRVING EDWARDS.

DEAR SIR: Thousands of sportsmen and nature lovers all over this country to-day are distressed over the rapid decrease of our game birds through insane legislation which permits every man of our thousands of hunters to kill 25 ducks a day and other birds in similar numbers. We, the undersigned residents of New Jersey, would most earnestly entreat you to do all in your power to pass the Copeland-Merritt bill, now before Congress—Senate bill 3580, House bill 10433—which offers some measure of relief.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by the World War veterans in the New York State Legislature, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the names, as follows:

Whereas the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill now pending before Congress would do away with the discrimination displayed toward one class of officers who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War, namely, the emergency officers; and

Whereas various statements have been made as to the attitude of ex-service men themselves on this measure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the World War veterans in the New York State Legislature, That we heartily indorse the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill, providing for the retirement of disabled emergency officers, and urge its speedy enactment; and be it further

Resolved, A copy of this resolution be forwarded to the national legislative representative of the various veteran organizations and to all of the New York State Representatives and to the two Senators of this State.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Rawlins, Wyo., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation proposing modification of the existing immigration laws, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hamilton and vicinity, in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against armed intervention by the United States in Mexico and Nicaragua other than for the protection of American lives and property, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, in the State of New York, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.